



CONSECRATION OF THE BELL.

THE
GREAT APOSTACY,
IDENTICAL WITH
PAPAL ROME;
OR
AN EXPOSITION
OF THE
MYSTERY OF INIQUITY,
AND THE
MARKS AND DOOM OF ANTICHRIST,
BY JOSEPH F. BERG.

PHILADELPHIA:
J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.
BAKER, Printer.
1842.

C
3404

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842, in the
Office of the Clerk of the District Court of the United States,
in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

19105523

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Moral Tendencies of Popery - - - - -	7
The Mass - - - - -	33
Penance - - - - -	64
Popish Baptism - - - - -	94
The Marks of Antichrist - - - - -	120
The Great Apostacy - - - - -	146
The Doom of Antichrist - - - - -	168

The reader is requested to make the following corrections:

On page 47, in reviewing one of the proof-texts, adduced in the Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, in support of communion in one kind, the mistake has been made of confounding the 27th with the 29th verse of 1 Cor. xi. In the 29th verse, the word *καί*, (and) is used, whereas in the 27th the usual reading is that for which the Church of Rome contends, viz. *ἢ*. (or.) By referring to the connection, it will be seen that we have done injustice to Pope Pius' Catechism in consequence of this mistake, and we therefore make all the amends in our power. So far as the general argument is concerned, it is not affected by this error. For, meeting the Romanist on his own terms, if the use of the disjunctive conjunction *OR*, proves communion in only one kind; the use of the copulative conjunction *AND*, in the same connection, must establish the communion in both kinds. Thus if in verse 27th it is said, "whosoever shall eat this bread, *OR* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily," and if from this construction an argument for the propriety of communion in only one kind is drawn, on precisely the same principle, we argue that in verse 29th, it is said, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, *AND* drink this cup unworthily, &c." and therefore communion in *BOTH* kinds is the scriptural mode. We are however, in duty bound, to give the Church of Rome credit, for one forgery less than we had charged to her account, although in the passage in question, the Alexandrian MS. has *AND* instead of *OR*.

On page 70, read *μεταμελεισθαι* instead of *μεταμελειν*. This error was committed during our absence from home.

PREFACE.

This volume is another attempt to expose in a plain manner, a few of the abominations of the Great Apostacy. It is offered to the public, with the full knowledge that it is an unvarnished statement of facts, which no one who is familiar with the peculiarities of the Papal System can either controvert or deny; if any reader deems the developements which it contains, beyond belief, we refer him to the books published with the sanction of the Church of Rome, which are the main sources from which we have gained our information. In exhibiting the doctrines and requirements of this apostate power, it is our invariable rule to state them in the language in which she has herself promulged them, (whenever this can be done without offending decency,) so that it will be in vain for those who adhere to the monstrous errors of Popery to charge us with misrepresentation. If this volume shall contribute in any degree to the promotion of the great cause of truth, and be

instrumental in delivering those who are held in the bondage of Antichristian delusion, or in saving any who are in danger of being entangled in its toils, the author will thank God. He is encouraged to hope that this result will be attained, from the success which has heretofore been vouchsafed to similar efforts, by the Father of mercies.

J. F. B.

Philad., Sept. 23, 1842.

MORAL TENDENCIES OF POPERY.

Matt. vii. 20.

WHEREFORE BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM.

THE principle asserted by the Saviour in these words is so reasonable, that even irreligious men cannot deny its justice. The only infallible evidence of a man's worth; is the general consistency and uprightness of his conduct. Professions, however specious, and however solemn, have no weight, unless sustained by a corresponding practice; for it is not by men's promises, but by their performance—by their fruits, that we know them. If this principle is universally adopted and applied in the judgment which men of the world pass upon the characters of those with whom they deal, the propriety of insisting upon it in our estimate of the *religious* character of an individual or of a society, will not be questioned. It is a great practical test, from which common honesty will never appeal. Now we admit there may be occasional inconsistencies in the conduct even of a good man, and there may be some tenets in the creed of a religious sect which we deem objectionable, and yet the judgment of charity will not suffer us to condemn the whole character of the man, or reject the entire creed of a denomination, on account of imperfections which we may discern. From this censorious spirit, the apostle's warning would deter us: "He shall have judgment

without mercy that showed no mercy." Besides, the love which we exercise towards God and our neighbour inclines us *to think no evil*, and to be ready always to put the most favourable construction upon doubtful appearances. But whilst we desire that love should have its perfect work, we may not forget that charity rejoices never in iniquity, but always in the truth. There is no virtue in throwing the mantle of charity over the sins of a notorious profligate;—there is a curse upon the man who calls good evil, and evil good, that puts light for darkness, and darkness for light, and bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter; and the false liberality which plumes itself upon the indifference with which it regards the most flagrant iniquity is the badge of the hypocrite, and not the characteristic of an upright Christian! "They that forsake the law praise the wicked, but such as keep the law contend with them." Whenever, therefore, we see an individual whose conduct is uniformly vicious, it is right to resist the influence he might exert upon our families or neighbours, by presenting his character in its true light; and if this cannot be denied, the duty becomes imperative, when the pernicious influence of a system of error threatens to undermine the very foundations of social order and virtue. Such a system is presented by the Romish apostacy. Its tendencies are evil, and only evil, and that continually. We defy the most devoted Romanist to show us the country in the world, whose morals have been improved by the discipline and government of his church. We go farther still. We challenge him to point out the nation, which has not been sunk into depths of depravity, the mere picture of which is enough to curdle the blood, and

chill the heart of the philanthropist, just in proportion to the strength with which the soul-destroying delusions of Popery have laid their iron grasp upon the mind and conscience and affections of a people. Popery has been the bane and the curse of every kindred and nation under the sun, in which it has been recognized as the established religion; and in precise proportion to the amount of influence which it has been permitted to exert in countries in which no restrictions have been imposed upon the movements and machinations of its hierarchy, have immorality, anarchy, confusion, and every evil work prevailed. These are propositions which we are prepared to sustain by an appeal to history; but it is not our present purpose to do so. We shall confine ourselves to a brief review of some of the prominent doctrines of Romanism, and by calling attention to the moral tendencies of these principles, endeavour to present a true picture of Popery as it is. In pursuance of our design, we shall have recourse not to the antiquated opinions of canonical doctors, whose infallible extravagances having long since become obsolete, are stoutly repudiated by the priesthood; who, nevertheless, boast of their glorious unity in faith and practice, and contend for the supremacy of the church, which is "always, and everywhere the same;" but in drawing the portrait of this moral Jezebel, we will give her all the advantages of the scarlet robe, nicely adjusted to conceal the deformities of her person, and adorned with all the trappings, and the tawdry finery, with which she deludes the simple, who, seduced by an imposing exterior, lack the discrimination necessary to discern between the sublime and the ridiculous. There was a time when

the Babylonish harlot walked in open day without her veil; her features distorted with fury, her eyes standing out with fatness, and gleaming with infernal malice; her voice discordant with passion, and breathing slaughter against the saints, whilst her hands, reeking with their blood, were lifted now in the mockery of saintly devotion, and then in the attitude of a malignant demon, drunken with cruelty; but that day is over. She has smoothed her brow—the wrinkles which furrowed her face have been artfully concealed—she has assumed the meekness of the lamb, and laid aside the ravening of the evening wolf. Yet with all her paint, her name is Jezebel still; in spite of all her artifice, and her attempts at concealment, we recognize her still as “the mother of the abominations of the earth.” Although she has endeavoured in some measure to adapt her principles to suit the spirit of the present age, such is their innate corruption, that any mind of ordinary powers of perception, that has not already drunk of her wine, will turn away from her with loathing; there is pollution in her touch; there is corruption in her creed; and her system of religious belief presents a chain of strong delusions, which must infallibly destroy every soul which it binds in allegiance to her throne! There never has been a time when the caution offered by the Saviour was more applicable than at the present day: “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?” &c. &c., Matt. vii. 15–20.

In tracing a few of the tendencies of the religious belief of Papists, we will make good the following charge. The

doctrines of the Church of Rome as taught in her standard works on theology, in use at the present day, inculcate fanaticism, gross immorality and persecution. In using this strong language, it is possible that we may appear to some to be bringing a railing accusation. All we ask of our readers is to suspend their judgment until we have done, and then they will be prepared to render a verdict and we shall be ready to abide by it. The work upon which we shall mainly rely to sustain this position is the edition of "Dens' System of Theology," published, A. D. 1838, under the supervision of the Archbishop of Mechlin, a town in the Netherlands, which is the arch-episcopal see. A synopsis of this work is before me, and I am willing to stake my reputation, not merely for scholarship, but for truth and honesty upon the fidelity of this translation. The priests in Philadelphia suffer the astounding developements of papal iniquity which it contains, to pass without venturing a word of explanation, or one solitary syllable of contradiction, though publicly complimented for their singular prudence, and reminded that guilt is always cowardly. Whatever other facts and statements may be adduced, will be derived from recent publications, issued under the inspection, and by the authority of the dignitaries of the Romish Church in this country.

I. In illustration of the charge of fanaticism, we adduce the doctrines of the papal church, relative to *witchcraft, miracles* and *fasting*.

1. Papists are devout believers in the exploded absurdities of the last two centuries respecting the power of witches: and Peter Dens deems it matter of sufficient importance to apprise papal students of theology, that *superstitious*

magic, or the art of effecting wonderful results by signs, through the aid of the devil, is still practised. In his disquisition on this subject, he discourses in the following words of wisdom :

“What do you call a magical sign?

“That which they exhibit or lay down according to an agreement, at least implicit with the devil, which being produced, the devil procures the effect.

“This sign sometimes consists in words, and is called *incantation*; sometimes in a permanent thing, as straw, pots, strings, bars, &c., v. g., straw plaited in a certain way is hidden in the earth, in order to kill animals; so long as that appointed sign of straw continues, the devil does injury to the cattle, unless he be hindered by exorcisms, or in some other way.”

He then assigns, amongst other remedies against magic—the use of the sign of the cross, priestly exorcisms, sprinkling a mixture of salt and water, termed holy water, the exhibition of sacred relics, and above all, “the lawful destruction of the magical sign: *viz.* by burning the straw or papers, by breaking the pots,” &c. After remarking that it is not always easy to discern whether an evil proceeds from witchcraft, or from some other cause, he gives the following rules for detecting it:—

“*Rules for discerning Witchcraft.*

“From what things can it be discerned, whether an evil proceeds from witchcraft, or from some other cause?

“*Ans.* This discrimination is sometimes difficult: however, these marks of witchcraft are usually assigned.

“1. If the evil exceeds the natural or ordinary cau-

salinity of things; v. g., if hair, bones, needles, bits of iron, &c., are found in the stomach.

"2. If the afflicted person suffers violence, by intervals, as it were.

"3. If skilful physicians are confidently of opinion that the evil does not proceed from a natural cause: if medicines, and other natural means, produce no effect.

"4. If spiritual means and exorcisms are seen to be specially advantageous; or, on the other hand, if when they are employed, the evil appears to be increased on their account; in which case we are not to cease, but more boldly to persevere with all spiritual means."

Now, we certainly believe that evil spirits exist, and that the prince of darkness rules in the children of disobedience, leading every unregenerate man in chains, more or less strong, captive, down the broad road to death, and we should rejoice if Romish exorcisms were as efficacious as the priests pretend, for it will furnish cheering evidence of a speedy overthrow of the powers of darkness, when the kingdom of Satan is thus divided against itself. We apprehend, however, that the evil one regards no ceremony with greater complacency than the priestly mummary performed with the due exhibition of holy water, holy relics, the sign of the cross, and the whole apparatus of exorcism.

2. *The lying wonders of Popery promulgated at this very day, furnish another illustration of the present fanaticism of the Romish Church.*—A series of works has recently appeared in Philadelphia, issued with the sanction of F. P. Kenrick, who styles himself Bishop of Arath, and more recently, Bishop of Philadelphia, consisting principally of lives of the saints, in

which the most preposterous fables are asserted with the utmost demureness. These saints, if we may believe their biographers, have actually performed greater miracles than the blessed Saviour and his apostles, and were so prodigal in the exercise of this power, that the most trifling occasion was sufficient to call it forth. I beg leave to read one or two literal extracts culled from these veracious histories. The following is taken from the life of St. Alphonsus Liguori, the author of a system of theology in common use in Romish Seminaries, and which abounds in the most iniquitous precepts.

“God rewarded his zeal by several prodigies; for one day, during a mission at Amalfi, a person going to confession at the house where Alphonsus lived, found him there at the time appointed for beginning the sermon in the church. After he had finished his confession, he went directly to the church, and, to his surprise, found Alphonsus some way advanced in his sermon. He was astonished at this circumstance; for, at his departure, he had left Alphonsus hearing the confessions of other persons at his house, and had not seen him come out of the only door, through which he could possibly pass to the church. It was therefore reported in the city that Alphonsus heard confessions at home, at the same time that he was preaching in the church. Whilst he was preaching on the patronage of the Blessed Virgin, and exciting his hearers to recur with confidence to her, in all their wants, he suddenly exclaimed, ‘O, you are too cold in praying to our Blessed Lady! I will pray to her for you.’ He knelt down in the attitude of prayer, with his eyes raised to heaven, and was seen by all present lifted more than a foot from the ground, and turned

towards a statue of the Blessed Virgin, near the pulpit. The countenance of Our Lady darted forth beams of light, which shone upon the face of the extatic Alphonsus. 'This spectacle lasted about five or six minutes, during which the people cried out, *'Mercy, mercy! a miracle, a miracle!'* and every one burst into a flood of tears. But the saint rising up, exclaimed in a loud voice, 'Be glad, for the Blessed Virgin has granted your prayer.' Before the missionaries left the city, Alphonsus foretold that an earthquake would take place on the following day; and the event proved the truth of his words."

But not content with narrating wonders of this kind, the biographer of Xavier relates a miraculous interposition of divine providence, in order to restore a lost bauble to the saint. The circumstances are as follows: one day as Xavier was leaning over the side of the ship, absorbed in meditation, he dropped a valuable crucifix into the sea; he was inconsolable on account of its loss, and continued so till the end of his voyage. After landing, he walked along the shore with some of his friends, and at a distance, perceived a crab moving towards him. As it approached he observed something in its claws, and what was the rapture of the saint in discovering his lost and lamented crucifix in the embrace of the crab. The creature lays the sacred article reverently at his feet, and then returns and disappears in the sea. Not to weary you with farther details of these mawkish absurdities, let me call your attention to a work entitled "*The Holy House of Loretto.*" This marvellous book assures us that the identical house in which the Virgin Mary was born and brought up, was transferred through

the air no less than four different times. The house is represented as a stone building, about 32 feet in length, 13 in breadth, and 18 in height, with a chimney, and a small belfry; and what is the most remarkable of all, the house has stood for the last six hundred years unsupported by any foundation. Whether the story, which is in a similar predicament, will stand so long, remains to be seen. No one who will examine his Bible with these illustrations before him, can be at a loss to discover the fulfilment of the prophecy in 2 Thess. ii. 9, where the apostle describing "that wicked whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming;" designates him more particularly, "even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." Who but the father of lies could instigate a rational creature to assert the preposterous and impudent falsehoods to which we have alluded, in such an age as this?

3. *The doctrines of the church of Rome with regard to fasting, are scarcely less absurd.*—In the first place, we affirm that there is no such thing in the Roman Catholic Church as real, bona fide fasting. It were folly to assert that ABSTINENCE FROM MEAT constitutes fasting, when food of any other nature may be substituted in its place. But this is the sum total of Roman Catholic fasting. On a fast day, according to Peter Dens, the church permits only one full refreshment, and this is to be taken about noon; but when our readers learn *how full* that refreshment may be, they will not be surprised that so few of the Romish hierarchy die of abstinence. In speaking of sins of the single refreshment, Dens remarks:

"Sin may be committed in a threefold way, in the case of the single refreshment: 1. By taking several refreshments, or several parts of a refreshment: 2. By dividing the refreshment, or interrupting it through a considerable time: 3. By protracting the refreshment to too long a time: for thus the refreshment is virtually multiplied.

"To how long a time may the refreshment be protracted?

"It is said reasonably, that IT MAY NOT BE PROTRACTED BEYOND TWO HOURS. Henno adds that THEN THE GUESTS ARE TO BE ADMONISHED TO ABSTAIN FROM EATING."

In addition to the *full* refreshment at noon, the faithful are permitted to partake of a *little collation* at evening. In answer to the question, "how much food may be taken for the little collation?" our author remarks:

"Some have appointed a certain quantity for all, or a fixed number of ounces of bread. S. Car. Borr. has determined an ounce and a half of bread, Cozza eight ounces, Concina three or four; but, as it seems, not with sufficient propriety; because, what would be very little for one man, v. g., a German, would be too much for another; say, an Italian: therefore the constitutions of persons should be regarded, the kinds of food, &c. For this reason, the quantity of the little collation is more properly determined by respect and proportion to the quantity this person needs for a moderate supper or refreshment; according to this mode, Van-den Bosch restricts the quantity of the little collation to the seventh or sixth part of a refreshment: Layman, Filluc, Busenbaum and others extend it to the fifth or fourth part of

a whole supper; and none are found, even the most liberal, who indulge regularly beyond the fourth part of an entire refreshment. Therefore, according to this more liberal computation, if I need for a meal sixteen ounces of food, I may take four ounces of bread for a collation."

Four ounces of bread, are as much as two hungry Protestants can consume at a meal; what then must be the capacity of an ecclesiastic, who consumes such a loaf at a fast-day supper? The questions which are discussed in the section, which treats of fasting, are as ridiculous as any that have ever perplexed the mind of man; e. g., "does the taking of chocolate break an ecclesiastical fast?" This intricate matter is decided in the affirmative by the lucid dissertation of Pope Benedict XIV. Then it is asked, whether those who have a dispensation to eat meat, may on the same day eat fish also? This is decided in the negative; but one who has a dispensation to eat *eggs*, may eat fish! Whether the taking of tobacco breaks the natural fast, is a mooted point. Peter Dens sums up the case as follows: "Benedict XIV. thinks that the fast is not broken by taking snuff or by smoking, but he determines nothing with respect to chewing."

We turn to 1 Tim. iv. 3, and among the marks of the apostacy distinctly foretold by the Holy Spirit, we read that one of them is "commanding to abstain from meats:" now this is literally fulfilled in the doctrine and discipline of the Romish Church. The apostle does not designate *fasting* as a peculiarity of this apostacy, but *abstinence from meats*. Could there be a more exact counterpart prepared than that which is furnished by

the Romish Church to our hands? Whoever eats MEAT on Friday, or in Lent, or on a day of ecclesiastical fast, commits a mortal sin, whose penalty is eternal damnation, unless the offence be obliterated by penance and priestly absolution.

II. *We proceed to the second charge, that of gross immorality.*—In illustration of this part of our subject, we will prove that the standard works on moral theology used by the Romish priesthood, inculcate equivocation, dishonesty and perjury, and that their doctrines tend to gross licentiousness. For the proof of this assertion, we shall refer to Peter Dens. And let me remark that the morality of his theology is pure, compared with that of St. Ligori. Many propositions approved by the latter, are condemned in no very measured terms by the Mechlin theologian. Contrary to the doctrine and practice of most of the doctors of the Romish Church, Dens affirms that it is unlawful to tell an untruth under any circumstances. Even if the object of the falsehood be to avert death, or the ruin of the state, or any other evil, the good Catholic is directed to betake himself to the help of God, or his guardian angel, and by no means to commit an offence against the truth. In this admonition, he differs widely from many authorities which he quotes, and what is the most unfortunate of all, his house is divided against itself, for he inculcates most stoutly in another connection, a practice which violates his own rule. In forbidding even mental restriction, Dens inadvertently affords melancholy proof of the prevalent disregard to truth, exhibited by many approved theologians of the Papal Church. He refers to one author, (and, judging from the repeated allusions which Dens

makes to his opinions, we should suppose that our theologian attached great weight to them,) and introduces him as asserting the following: "It is lawful for a homicide, who is asked whether he has killed that man, to reply, I have not killed him, by secretly understanding in his mind, so that I ought to confess it to you; in the same way that it is lawful to reply to one who asks whether a robber has passed this way: he has not passed this way, if he at the same time puts his hand into his glove, meaning that he has not passed through the glove; for this sign is supposed to be secret, or not perceptible, so as to be signified together with the rest; just as the motion of the eyes in speaking would not be a sufficient consignant sign to be secretly understood externally, *he has not passed through my eyes.*"

"However, if this thrusting of the hand into the glove should be sufficiently manifest, and perceptibly or intelligibly connected with words, then Boudart himself excuses the reply from falsehood," &c. &c.

Dens then proceeds to justify ambiguity and equivocation, and affirms that when a proposition contains a double meaning, it is lawful intentionally to permit a person to be deceived by his wrong understanding; you are not answerable for any mistake into which he may himself fall, and all that is requisite is that you intend to speak the truth which is in your mind. He affirms that such equivocation is not deception, and actually attempts to sustain this abominable principle by the example of Christ himself! He says:

"An opportune mode of getting rid of the importunate questions of inquisitive men, is reciprocally to propose a question: v. g., if they ask, whether you know this?

whether you have done this? you may reply, whence should I know this? why should I do this? &c. In a similar way, Christ, Luke xxiv. 19, to the question of the disciples going to Emmaus, replied, saying: *What things?"*

The priests should know surely that there was no equivocation or ambiguity in this question of the Saviour, and that the object of the Redeemer was not to draw away the minds of the disciples from the truth, but to lead them to it. The attempt to make the Saviour favour equivocation is sheer blasphemy, and the very effort at elaborate refutation would be irreverent.

2. *Dishonesty is recommended with unblushing effrontery.*—The general principle is laid down that theft becomes a venial sin, principally in two ways: viz. from the "imperfect deliberation of the act, and from the trifling value of the matter;" and to these are appended two more circumstances, "ignorance slightly culpable" that the thing was the property of another; and that the owner, in a matter of importance, is not much opposed to the unjust removal of his property, but is unwilling only as to the mode of taking it. As to the amount requisite to constitute theft a mortal sin, Dens observes:

"What quantity appears absolutely sufficient for mortal theft in regard to amount?"

"The more common and plausible opinion reckons that the hire or daily wages of a man labouring in some honourable trade is sufficient; that is three or four shillings for this time and for this country; because, in proportion as daily labour is accounted severe, the pay is correspondent."

Theft is declared to be lawful in case of necessity.

"*Concerning the palliations or Excuses of thefts.* (89.)

"There are two principal claims, under which thefts are wont to be covered; namely, the claims of *necessity*, and of *just compensation*. Hence it is asked: Whether it is lawful to steal in a case of necessity: or rather, whether it is lawful to take another's property on account of necessity?

"*I. Observe.* It is important to distinguish a threefold necessity: *extreme*, in which life is in danger: *urgent*, in which health, or station is endangered; and *common*, which the poor suffer everywhere.

"*II. Ans.* It is lawful to take another man's property, either secretly or openly, in so far as there is necessity for supplying extreme want: the reason is, because then all things are common."

And again, the following assertion is found in the course of the discussion on this subject:

"Is he who takes a considerable sum by small thefts, bound under mortal sin to restore the whole?

"*Ans.* No: BUT IN ORDER TO BE FREE FROM THE MOR-
TAL SIN OF UNJUST DETENTION, IT IS SUFFICIENT TO MAKE
RESTITUTION SO FAR THAT WHAT HE RETAINS MAY NO
LONGER BE A SERIOUS AMOUNT."

Now, I would ask is this the religion of the Bible? Does the word of God tell us that the theft of an article of small value is a venial offence? Jesus Christ affirms, "He that is unjust in that which is least, is unjust also in much." The very weakness of the temptation aggravates the guilt of the transgressor. What can be more execrable than the principle, that the wickedness of the offender is to be estimated by the feel-

ings with which the injured party resents the trespass. If he is a merciful man, whose kind heart is pained on account of the guilt incurred by the thief; if he would rather have given him the stolen property than see him burden his soul with the commission of crime, the robber commits a venial offence; but if the owner of the stolen goods is a churlish Nabal, a very son of Belial, who is enraged at the loss of his property, the thief perpetrates a mortal offence. Oh! tempora! Oh! mores! Here is a specimen of the corrupt fruit of that tree, whose deadly shade has filled the earth with the darkness of the shadow of death. By their fruits ye shall know them.

3. *But these doctrines, bad as they are, are not by any means so grossly immoral as some other tenets of this apostate church. A confessor is obliged under certain circumstances to commit perjury.*—My reader is aware that the great bulwark of the confessional is the injunction of secrecy imposed upon the priest. This obligation of concealing the things, which are learned from sacramental confession, is called the sacramental seal. The ecclesiastical law which enjoins that secrets learned from confession must be preserved at all hazards, is to this effect. “Let the priest beware, that he do not by any means betray the sinner, by word or sign, or by any other mode; but if he is in want of prudent counsel, let him cautiously inquire, without any mention of the person; since we decree that he who shall presume to reveal a sin detected by him in penitential judgment, shall not only be deposed from the priestly office, but shall be thrust into a closed monastery, to perform perpetual penance.” Nothing which has been learned at the confessional may be revealed to a third person on any pre-
c*

text whatever. It is declared to be a sin of sacrilegious treachery to divulge a plot, even against the life of an individual, or the liberty of the state. This disclosure may not be made, (we will quote Dens' own words):

"ALTHOUGH THE LIFE OR SALVATION OF A MAN, OR THE RUIN OF THE STATE SHOULD DEPEND UPON IT: NOR CAN THE POPE GIVE ANY DISPENSATION IN THIS CASE; SO THAT THIS SECRET OF THE SEAL, IS THEREFORE MORE BINDING, THAN THE OBLIGATION OF AN OATH, VOW, NATURAL SECRET, &c.; and this from the positive will of God.

"What, therefore, must a confessor reply, who is asked concerning the truth, which he has learned through sacramental confession alone?"

"HE MUST REPLY THAT HE DOES NOT KNOW IT, AND IF IT IS NECESSARY, HE MUST CONFIRM THE SAME WITH AN OATH."

Here then the Romish priest is taught that he may forswear himself. An attempt is made to obviate this objection; let us hear how our author labours to refute it.

"OBJ. *In no case is it lawful to lie: but this confessor would lie, because he knows the truth; therefore, &c.*

"ANS. I deny the minor; because such a confessor is interrogated as a man, and answers as a man: BUT NOW HE DOES NOT KNOW THIS TRUTH AS A MAN, ALTHOUGH HE MAY KNOW IT AS GOD, says St. Thom., &c.: and this sense is naturally in the answer: for when he is questioned or replies out of confession, he is considered as a man."

We open the New Testament at 2 Thessalonians iii, 4, and we read. "Let no man deceive you by any

means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or worshipped; so that he AS God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Where is the wayfaring man in such haste that he cannot see that this prediction to the very letter, is fulfilled in the acknowledged principles of the Papal Church? Methinks a fool cannot err herein. Compare the doctrine of the Roman Church, with the prophetic declaration of the Holy Spirit. "The priest does not know this truth as a man, though he may know it AS God." "The man of sin AS God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." It is only in the temple, and at the confessional, that the priest shows himself that he is God: "for when he is questioned or replies out of confession, he is considered as a man. If Rome had sat for her portrait, the apostle could not have depicted her features with greater fidelity and accuracy than they are portrayed in the word of God. It is by asserting the impious blasphemy that the priest is God, and then framing a no less impious distinction between his actions as God and man, that the Romish priest relieves his conscience of the guilt of perjury. But let us read one or two paragraphs farther, and "the mystery of iniquity" becomes still more apparent, like "darkness visible."

"What if it be directly asked from the confessor, whether he knows this through sacramental confession?"

"Ans. In this case he need answer nothing: so Steyaert with Sylvius; but the question is to be rejected as impious: or also, he might say absolutely, not relatively

to the question: *I know nothing*: because the word *I*, restricts to human knowledge.

“LIKEWISE, IF A CONFESSOR BE CITED IN A JUDICIAL CASE, THAT HE MAY GIVE HIS REASON FOR REFUSING ABSOLUTION; HE MUST PROTEST THAT IN THIS CASE, HE ACKNOWLEDGES NO SUPERIOR, EXCEPT GOD.”

If the priest sits in the temple *as God*, we need not marvel, if he claims to be superior to any human tribunal; all we have to do as good citizens and Christian men is to see to it, that he be not permitted to carry out his infamous principles into practical operation.

4. *We were to show that Popery tends to gross licentiousness.*—If we chose, we might prove our position by a reference to every country in the old and new world, in which the doctrines of the Romish Church, are sustained by the secular arm. There you will find the Sabbath desecrated, and celebrated as a day of dissipation, a holiday on which Satan is to be served with greater energy than in all the week besides. What is the testimony of those who have visited the papal countries of Europe and South America? Is it not that the priests are the most adroit gamblers to be found amongst those who make gambling a profession? Is it not that they are the most dissolute and licentious among those who are notorious for profligacy? Look at Rome, and what have we there? At the seat of *sanctity*, in the metropolis of the *Christian* world, under the very eyes of the pontiff, and by the special indulgence of the Pope, we find brothels licensed and sanctioned by HIS HOLINESS! What need we farther witness? By their fruits ye shall know them. But is not this the result of causes, whose operation is to be sought apart from the Romish

Church? We say no! This profligacy is the necessary and inevitable effect of the principles and doctrines of the false religion which usurps the name of Catholic. And if you ask us to point out the doctrine and practice which more than any other conduces to this result, we name the sacrament of penance, which includes auricular confession, works of satisfaction or penance, and priestly absolution and indulgence. This is the prolific source whence Rome derives her undisputable title to the name of the *Mother of the abominations of the earth*. This is the bitter fountain which has deluged so many nations with a flood of delusion; the moral Mephitis which exhales the pestilential fumes that steep the conscience, and the souls of men in the lethargy of death. The priests claim the power of forgiving sins, in the very face of the Scripture, which affirms that none can forgive sin but God only! Let a man believe this, and will this conviction make him solicitous to avoid sin? Will he regard it as the abominable thing which God hates, and which he threatens with the penalty of everlasting death? Experience tells us no! He will work iniquity with greediness, for he can cancel all his guilt by confessing to his priest, and performing the penance which is imposed by the confessor. Then, look for a moment at the brutalizing influence of the questions proposed by the officiating priests! The apostle Paul tells us that it is a shame to speak of certain deeds of darkness wrought by the Gentiles, but it is a shame even to *think* of things, concerning which the most obscene inquisition is made at the confessional. Certain are we in our own minds, that, not even an angel from heaven, if endowed with human susceptibilities, could eventually remain

proof against the polluting influence, which familiarity with the grossest forms of licentiousness must exert upon the heart. Modesty drops dead when she crosses the threshold of the confessional; and purity never submits a second time to its horrid scrutiny!

III. *We were to show that persecution is an essential feature in the papal system.*—It has been common for some whose natural benevolence prompts them to believe that popery has materially altered the statutes of its bloody code, and for others, who speak dogmatically upon a subject of which they are profoundly ignorant, and for priests, and their dupes, and abettors to affirm that the Church of Rome is no longer the enemy of religious liberty! But how can this be? Is she not infallible? Were not the œcumenical councils from which issued the fulminations of wrath, against heretics, animated by the spirit of heaven? So say the priests! God lead them to repentance, and forgive them for ascribing merciless cruelty to the Spirit of grace! But if these councils were infallible, then it was right to affirm that no faith is to be kept with heretics, and it is right to act on that principle now. The fire and faggots which triumphantly refuted the arguments of the Bohemian heretic, and wafted John Huss to heaven in a chariot of flame, would be employed to-morrow to convince the obstinate heretic that Rome is right, and that he is wrong, were it not that expediency enjoins forbearance. The papal church loses its character so soon as this bloody trait is obliterated. Blood is her element. She thirsts for blood. She is drunken with the blood of the saints; and if ever the Almighty in his wrath permits the liberties of this country to succumb under the machi-

nations of the emissaries of Antichrist, a cry of lamentation and wo will come up to heaven from the length and breadth of the land, and there will be blood to the horses' bridles! We hold before you the system of theology which contains the present principles of the priests of Rome promulgated in 1838, and we ask you to listen to a few sentences more, which we will read from it before we close.

"Baptized infidels, such as heretics and apostates usually are, also baptized schismatics, may be compelled, even by corporeal punishments, to return to the Catholic faith, and the unity of the church."

"The reason is, because these by Baptism have become subject to the church; and therefore the church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them through appointed means to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in baptism."

"Are the rites of infidels to be tolerated?"

"Ans. The rites of Jews, although they sin in exercising them, can be tolerated with some moderation; because great good accrues to the church from them, viz: because we have a testimony to our faith from enemies, as by their rites, those things which we believe are represented to us figuratively.

"It was said, 'with some moderation;' because if there be danger that the Jews by their peculiar rites offer scandal to Christians, the church can and ought to restrain or hinder, as shall be expedient: hence it has been decreed, (Bk. 5. Decret. tit. 6. ch. 3 and 7,) that it be not permitted to the Jews to have many synagogues in one state, nor to build new ones in many places.

"The rites of other infidels, viz: pagans and heretics,

in themselves (considered), ARE NOT TO BE TOLERATED : BECAUSE THEY ARE SO BAD, THAT NO TRUTH OR ADVANTAGE FOR THE GOOD OF THE CHURCH CAN BE THENCE DERIVED.

"Except, however, unless greater evils would follow, or greater benefits be hindered."

And finally :—"Are heretics rightly punished with death ?

"St. Thomas answers, (2. 2. quest. xi. art. 3. in corp.) YES, BECAUSE FORGERS OF MONEY, OR OTHER DISTURBERS OF THE STATE, ARE JUSTLY PUNISHED WITH DEATH ; THEREFORE ALSO HERETICS, WHO ARE FORGERS OF THE FAITH, AND EXPERIENCE BEING THE WITNESS, GRIEVOUSLY DISTURB THE STATE."

Here then we have evidence clear as the sun, that all that the priestly emissaries of Rome are awaiting is the time when it shall be expedient to throw away the mask, and draw from beneath their robe the right hand which clenches the assassin's dagger. If that time ever arrives, they will give us bloody demonstration that heretics are justly punished with death ! One or two remarks by way of inference and we have done.

How ineffably ridiculous and contemptible is the charge of persecution, when alleged against Protestant ministers, who expose the errors and wickedness of the Papal system.—It is not quite so common as it used to be for such as have a little reputation for common sense and honesty to raise the cry of persecution, whenever facts are stated which bear hard upon the papacy ! We are not the friends of reckless denunciation ! We have no animosity against *individuals* who give heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils ! It is because we love their souls that we seek to arouse them to a sense of

their danger! We hold ourselves to be the friends of our Roman Catholic brethren, and God is our witness, that by day and by night we stand prepared to do them all the good we can, and to minister to their temporal and spiritual wants to the utmost of our ability. But shall we see an enemy secretly sapping the foundations of your house, and preparing the train which is to hurl your habitation to the earth, and never breathe a note of warning till the mine is sprung? Or shall we watch the midnight incendiary as he approaches your dwelling, whilst you are wrapped in sleep, shall we quietly look on, and see him light his match and adjust his combustibles, and apply the fire, shall we watch the smoke as it issues from your dwelling, and look at the flames as they curl up from their concealment? If we cry "fire" before the flames burst from your windows, will you charge us with persecution? If you do, we shall raise a louder alarm, and save you if we can! And if we see our brother's soul in danger; if we see that he is walking a road whose steps take hold on hell; if we see him beginning to go down the sides of the pit, shall we hold our peace and let him perish for fear that some sentimental Puseyite or some sickly Protestant may cry "persecution?" Strange that men who believe the Bible to be God's word, should require us to apologize for opposing popery! If we turn to 1 Tim. iv. 6, we find that Paul portrays the marks of Antichrist to the very life: after telling his son in the gospel, that it shall be an apostasy—not a foreign system of error, but a departure from the truth, giving heed to doctrines of devils or *daemon gods*, (*i. e.* souls of departed men made objects of worship,) forbidding to marry, commanding to

D

abstain from meats, he adds these remarkable words : "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine whereunto thou hast attained." The injunction to put the brethren in remembrance of these things, is addressed to Christian ministers with greater emphasis now than it was to Timothy, because when Paul wrote, all that was on record respecting Antichrist was prophecy, but now it is history. We see every feature of this apostate power developed, and how I ask, dare a good minister of Jesus Christ in this day, fail to *put the brethren in remembrance of these things*?

My brethren, when God shall judge the Babylonish woman, and they who have drunk of the wine of her fornication, shall receive of her plagues, and they who have lent their power to the beast shall be cast into the lake that burneth with fire ; let none of us be found with the damning mark on our forehead, or in our right hand, but washed in the glorious Saviour's blood, and clothed in his righteousness, may we be ready to rejoice in the overthrow of Antichrist ; may our voices swell the chorus of that great multitude, whose shout of praise shall be as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia : for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth !

THE MASS.

FOR BY ONE OFFERING, HE HATH PERFECTED FOREVER THEM THAT ARE SANCTIFIED. Heb. x. 14.

THE subject which at present claims our attention constitutes one of the most important tenets of the Church of Rome, and may in some respects be said to involve the whole ground of controversy between the Protestant and Papal churches. If the sacrifice of the Mass can be vindicated on the authority of Scripture; if it can be shown that Jesus Christ and his apostles said mass, and appointed the perpetual offering of its unbloody sacrifice as an institution to be observed to the end of time by all who would successfully claim fellowship with His church—the church which He loved and purchased, and washed in his blood, then are we all bound by obligations, solemn as death and judgment and eternal retribution can render them, to bow in obedience to the mandates of the Papal See, and forthwith to seek reconciliation with him, who avows himself the Vicar of Christ upon earth. I repeat it, if the word of God contains explicit injunctions requiring the observance of this peculiar rite; if it is any where affirmed in the Old and New Testaments, that Jesus Christ, after having offered the bloody sacrifice upon Calvary, for our offences, and being raised again for our justification, instituted in his church the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, not merely in order to perpetuate the memory of His sufferings and death,

but actually to repeat that atoning sacrifice itself as often as mass is said or offered by a priest of Rome, then my brethren, you and I, and all who glory in the name of Protestant, and rejoice in it, the more it is repudiated and anathematized by the friends of the Papacy; we all are under immediate and imperative obligation to hasten to the constituted authorities and implore the pardon and absolution, which they profess to dispense. If the mass is really a Christian ordinance, then I must for ever perish, unless I seek to derive from it the precious benefits, which the Pope and priests of Rome promise to their devotees; for it must be remembered this is the great characteristic ceremony of the Romish Church—the hinge upon which the whole system turns. On the other hand, if it can be demonstrated that there is no authority in God's word for this practice; that there is no *priesthood* of divine appointment under the New Testament to offer sacrifice for the living and the dead; if it can be proved that the Holy Spirit in so many words has declared and *here* recorded that the great atoning sacrifice was offered *once*, and but *once*, and *once* for all, and that by this *one* offering of the Lord Jesus Christ, God has forever perfected them that are sanctified; if it can be shown that the Mass is a human invention, an unauthorized and unjustifiable innovation, and that its inevitable tendency and unfailing result has always been to depreciate the merit of the blessed Saviour's sufferings, and substitute in place of that great propitiation, a ceremony which totally subverts the whole gospel plan of mercy, then our Roman Catholic brethren are under obligations equally weighty and solemn, to renounce their allegiance to the Pope, forsake the priests who offer mass, and join

themselves to the true church, built upon the foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ *himself*, (not the sacrifice of a morsel of bread,) but Jesus Christ *himself*, being the chief corner stone. I desire then, with respect and tenderness, to appeal to those who are attached to the Roman Catholic persuasion, and to beseech them to remember, that if mistaken in this point, their error will necessarily be fatal, and their ruin inevitable. It will be but a little while, and we shall all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; there will be no opportunity *then* of rectifying mistakes, or recovering from their effects; there will be no place for repentance *there*; if under the influence of a deadly delusion *now*, we must escape from the snare of Satan speedily, or it will ere long be too late. With these preliminary remarks, I proceed to offer the explanation which Roman Catholics themselves give of the sacrifice of the mass. The authority to which I appeal is the Grounds of Catholic Doctrine contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius V.

Q. *What is the Catholic Doctrine of the Mass?*

A. That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Q. *What do you mean by the Mass?*

A. The consecration and oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine: so that the Mass was instituted by Christ himself at His Last Supper: Christ himself said the first Mass; and ordained that His apostles and their successors should do the like. Do this in remembrance of me. Luke 22.

D*

Q. What do you mean by a propitiatory sacrifice?

A. A sacrifice for obtaining mercy, or by which God is moved to mercy.

Q. How do you prove that the Mass is such a sacrifice?

A. Because in the Mass, Christ himself, as we have seen, chap. 4. is really present, and by virtue of the consecration, is there exhibited and presented to the Father under the sacramental veils, which by their separate consecration represent his death. Now what can more move God to mercy than the oblation of His only Son, there really present, and under this figure of death representing to his Father that death which he suffered for us.

In immediate opposition to this, I will read the following extract from the Heidelberg Catechism, the symbolical book of the Reformed Church of Germany and Switzerland, which contains our profession of faith.

“What difference is there between the Lord’s supper and the Popish mass?”

The Lord’s supper testifies to us, that we have a full pardon of all sin by the only sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which He himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that we by the Holy Ghost are ingrafted into Christ, who, according to his human nature, is now not on earth, but in heaven, at the right hand of God His father, and will there be worshipped by us: but the mass teacheth, that the living and the dead have not the pardon of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is also daily offered for them by the priests; and further, that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and therefore is to be worshipped in them; so that the mass at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacri-

fice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry.

Here then we join issue. Our plan will be briefly to examine the proof, which is offered in support of the doctrine of the mass, and then to adduce the evidence which controverts it. But we will in the first place endeavour to bring the whole ceremony before the minds of our readers, as accurately as we can without an actual representation. In order that the priest may celebrate mass properly, it is necessary that he wear at least the principal sacred vestments, such as the alb, which is a white linen garment, bearing a very close resemblance to the piece of raiment, which in plain English would be called a shirt; he must also throw around his neck, the stole, which is to represent the cord with which our Saviour was led to execution; to celebrate the mass without these two vestments would be a grievous sin, but if only the maniple or the girdle be dispensed with, the offence is not mortal, but venial. When the priest puts on the sacred robes, he is bound to recite certain prayers prescribed by the rubrics under pain of mortal sin. Over all this consecrated apparatus, a rich vestment variously figured, is thrown. Sometimes there is on it the picture of God or the Holy Ghost, or some passage of sacred history, or a cross wrought behind and before; and this robe we are to understand is significant of the purple vestment in which the blessed Saviour was arrayed when mocked by his enemies. After his reverence has moved to the altar, attended by a clerk, or sometimes a boy, who is provided with a little bell, he commences a course of prostrations and genuflexions, and bowings and crossings, and scrapings, which are all intended to

be very significant, but the meaning of which is probably hidden from most of the faithful, who witness them. These edifying gesticulations are interlarded with divers Latin prayers, and at the words "mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa," the priest violently strikes his breast to show that sin lies in the heart. After the canon of the mass, consisting of a long series of litanies and prayers, is ended, the priest makes the sign of a cross over the wafer and the chalice, standing with his back to the people, and takes up the wafer in his hands; then at the signal given by the ringing of the bell, the people look up, whilst the priest repeats the consecration in Latin, in these words, "The day before our Lord suffered, he took bread into his adorable hands, and lifting up his eyes to heaven to God, and giving thanks, he blessed, (and here the priest makes the sign of the cross over the wafer,) brake and gave to his disciples, saying, Take, eat ye all of this, for it is my body." Whilst these last five words are uttered, the wafer is transubstantiated; i. e. changed into the body and blood, bones, sinews and nerves, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. That which before the utterance of these five words was a morsel of bread has now become the Redeemer of the world. And now, the priest reverently raises the consecrated wafer above his head; this act is called the elevation of the host. This done, at the sound of the bell, all the faithful bow down and worship it. After this ceremony is over, the priest takes up the cup saying, "In like manner after supper, He took this noble chalice into His holy and adorable hands, and after thanks to the Father, He blessed, (here he makes another sign of the cross,) and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take ye, and drink

you ALL of this : for this is the cup of my blood, a new and everlasting testament, a mystery of faith which shall be shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins ; so oft as you do this, you shall do it in remembrance of me." The words of consecration are uttered in a low tone of voice, and the priest, taking the cup in his hand, breathes upon the wine and kneels down to it and the host ; then rising up he holds the cup over his head, that the people may likewise worship it. This part of the ceremony over, he sets down the chalice, covers it up again with the cloth, and then once more kneels before the host and cup, and with outstretched arms, kisses the altar. I shall not attempt to follow the celebrator through all the succeeding evolutions ; suffice it to say, after a world of circumstance, and turnings and facings, and kissings and crossings, innumerable, the priest drinks up the wine, and does his very best to extract every drop from the cup, that he may with a clear conscience affirm that he has drunk ALL of it. After the reading of a few prayers and collects, the mass is over and the assembly is dismissed. Now is it possible that men can be found, prepared to maintain that such ceremonies as these constitute a part of the worship of that God, who is a spirit, and who will be worshipped in spirit and in truth ? Where do you find one single passage—one solitary syllable in the word of God, which authorizes these multifarious forms ? I wish not to wound the feelings of any Roman Catholic, but I say, as I shall answer before my God, this ceremony is a shameful prostitution of His ordinance ; it is mummery, both absurd and blasphemous ! But what is the proof, which is offered in support of this strange doctrine ? And remember what is the meaning

of the mass—"the consecration and oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine : " "in the mass, Christ himself is really present, and by virtue of the consecration, is there exhibited, and presented to the eternal Father under the sacramental veils, which by their separate consecration represent his death." The doctrine of the Romish Church therefore is, that by the sacrifice of the mass, all the benefits of the original sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, are secured to the individual in whose behalf it is offered ; that it is in short a repetition of the atoning oblation made on Calvary, when Jesus bowed his head upon the cross.

Q. What Scripture do you bring for this ?

A. The words of consecration as they are related by St. Luke, chap. 22. v. 19, 20. "This is my Body which is given for you. This cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which (cup) is shed for you." For if the cup be shed for us, that is, for our sins, it must needs be propitiatory, at least by applying to us the fruits of the bloody sacrifice of the cross.

I shall not enter at present into an elaborate refutation of the tenet of "transubstantiation," but shall merely remark that if the words, "this is my body," and "this is my blood," be adduced as evidence of the real presence, on the same principle, other similar expressions of Christ must be understood literally. Now he tells us ; "*I am* the true vine." "*I am* the door." "*I am* the way." And the apostle after referring to the rock from which the water flowed, which followed the Israelites in all their wanderings through the desert, tells us, "that rock was Christ." Consequently if the Roman Catholic

argues, Christ does not say this bread *represents* my body, but "this *is* my body," and therefore the doctrine of transubstantiation is true;" I reply Christ says, I *am* the true vine—not I am *like a vine*, but I *am* the true, i. e. the real vine, and therefore the Saviour is a vine which has branches and tendrils and leaves and fruit. And on the same principle, he is a *door*, and a *way*, and a *rock*; for the apostle says "*that Rock was Christ.*" Again, adopting the Romish interpretation of the Saviour's words to Peter, we can apply the argumentum ad hominem to the advocates of transubstantiation. Christ says to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." The meaning of Peter is a rock, and Roman Catholic divines propose to render this passage, "Thou art a rock, and upon this rock, &c." Hence on the same principle by which the doctrine of the *real presence* is maintained, the apostle must have been transformed into a real rock, for Christ does not say, thou art *like a rock*, but thou *art* a rock. But hear the second passage. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which (cup) is shed for you." "For if the cup be shed for us, i. e. for our sins, it must needs be propitiatory, at least by applying to us the fruits of the bloody sacrifice of the cross." This is Biblical criticism with a vengeance! The priests make the relative pronoun "*which*," refer to "cup" instead of to the word "blood." "This *cup* is the New Testament, &c. which *cup* is shed, &c." though it must be manifest to every man of common sense, that it relates to the word *blood*. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which (*blood*) is shed for you." Whoever heard of a *cup being shed*? And who would suppose from reading these words in their natural con-

nection that the Saviour intended to imply the meaning which the priests affix to it. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you," i. e. the cup, not my blood, but the *cup* is shed for you! Now, this is a bare-faced imposition. It is a simple principle in hermeneutics, that a proper mode of ascertaining the sense of a passage, is to collate it with parallel texts of Scripture. Now let us do this in the case before us. Turn to the 26th of Matthew, 27th and 28th verses, and we read, "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Will the priests tell us that "*the New Testament*," is shed for many for the remission of sins? Apart from the absurdity of such an interpretation, apart from the *nonsense* of speaking of a *new testament being shed*, there is a grammatical difficulty in the way, which cuts off all retreat into that hiding place. Those of our readers, who have a little knowledge of Greek, are aware that in the idiom of that language, the three genders of masculine, feminine, and neuter, are applied to inanimate or lifeless things as well as to animate or living objects. In English it is not so; except in cases where an inanimate object is personified, the masculine and feminine are used to denote the male and female of living objects, whilst the neuter is the universal gender of inanimate things. In English, the word *testament* is neuter, so is the word *blood*; but in Greek the word διαθηκη (*testament*) is *feminine*, whilst αιμα (*blood*) is neuter. Now the relative pronoun in Greek must be of the same gender with its antecedent—if the word "which," refers to *testament*, in Greek it

must be feminine, if its antecedent is the word *blood*, it must be neuter ; but it is *neuter*, thus showing that it refers to blood ; so that the meaning is, “ this is my blood of the New Testament, which (*blood*) is shed for many for the remission of sins.” In the passage in Luke, which is quoted in the Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, the language is, “ This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.” The word *ποτηριον*, cup, and *αιμα*, blood are both neuter in Greek, so that the antecedent is not to be discerned in that case, except by a regard to the sense, and by adopting the rule, which I have followed, viz. a comparison of this text with parallel passages. I hope my readers have understood this explanation ; if they have, they are prepared to appreciate the wicked deception of the priests, who pervert Scripture to make it support the doctrine of the mass. They tell us the *cup* is shed—when the original evidently means—the *blood* is shed. By teaching *that the cup is shed*, they obtain some plausibility for their side of the question, and argue as follows, “ for if the *cup* be shed for us, i. e. for our sins, it must needs be propitiatory.” Now, I appeal to Roman Catholics, and I ask, what are we to think of the moral honesty of your priests, when they deceive you in this shameful manner ? What kind of teachers are they, who put into your hands a Catechism like this, and tell you that it contains the form of doctrine, which you must believe and obey if you would be saved, whilst they are wilfully wresting Scripture to *your* destruction, as well as their own ? I say the deception is wilful—but if you prefer, you may believe that it is a mistake made inadvertently. But then I ask you, will you commit the keeping of your souls to men,

who forbid you to think for yourselves, and declare that you must follow them as your spiritual guides, or be damned, and who are so shamefully ignorant of the word of God, and the rules of interpreting it, as to be capable of making such a blunder as this? Why a school-boy would be ashamed to bungle at his grammar as your pope or priests have done in this catechism! Search the Scriptures my brethren for yourselves, and see whether these things are so. But let us proceed. It is affirmed, that *Christ himself said the first mass*. If this be so, what becomes of all the fantastic ceremonies performed by Papal priests when they offer mass? Why do they not say mass as Jesus Christ said it, and as the evangelists describe the institution of the Lord's Supper? Did Jesus wear an alb, and a stole, and a maniple, and a splendid robe, and hang a crucifix about his neck, and bow down to the bread, and kiss the cup, and embrace the altar, and go through the intricate gesticulations of the Romish mass priests? If he did, how very strange it is that neither Matthew nor Mark, nor Luke, nor the apostle Paul, (1 Corinthians), every one of whom describes the ceremony of the institution of this ordinance, has said not one single word, which gives the shadow of authority to the least of these trifling and impious ceremonies! If Christ himself said the first mass, as the Romish priests tell us, then out of their own book are these same Popish priests condemned! But it is blasphemy to assert any such thing. The Saviour never said mass. He did not stand at the altar to offer himself a sacrifice to God! He did not elevate the wafer over his head, and bid Peter or even *Judas* ring a bell, as a signal for his twelve disciples to bow down and worship that piece

of bread. He did not say to his disciples, "sacrifice my body and blood," make "an unbloody oblation of me!" But he sat at a common table; he did not stand before an altar; and he gave thanks to God for the bread; he did not make the sign of the cross over it; but he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said "Take, eat, this is my body," he did not intend thereby to intimate that he held his own body in his hands, and that he was distributing his flesh, and bones, and blood, and sinews, and nerves, and soul, and divinity; but he wished them to understand that he was instituting an ordinance which to the end of time should be a memorial of his sufferings and death! But *Christ himself said the first mass*, if we are to believe papal priests. Then I ask again, why do not the priests conform to his example in the second part of the ordinance? Jesus Christ did not take up the cover of the cup, and cross himself on the breast, forehead and crown—he did not make the sign of the cross three times over the top, and twice on the brim of the cup—he did not drink up all the wine himself, and then hold out the cup for more wine, until he had thrice emptied it—but he blessed it, and gave it to his disciples and said, "drink ye *all* of it," or as Luke says, "Take this and divide it among yourselves;" or as Mark says, "He took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they *ALL* drank of it," plainly showing that the Saviour meant *all his disciples were to drink of that cup*, not that His disciples were to drink *all* the wine. This is manifest, not only from the language of Mark and Luke, but also from that of Matthew, "drink ye *all* of it," not "drink up all the wine," do not suffer a drop of the wine to be left in the cup, lest my blood

should be sacrilegiously wasted, but "do ye all drink of it." In the original Greek, this is perfectly clear—for the words Πετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, literally rendered, mean, "Drink ye all out of it." Besides the word πάντες, *all*, is in the masculine plural, evidently alluding to persons, to the disciples therefore, not in the neuter singular, as it must have been if the word *all* referred to the *wine*. Now here is another piece of wicked deception on the part of the priests; in the very face of their Greek Testament, they make the word *ALL* allude to the wine! And hence they drink up *all* the wine. But what right have they to do this? Did Christ drink it all himself? No, he gave it to his disciples, and said that they were all, without exception, to share in it. "Ah! but," replies the priest, "remember will you, that Christ had his *apostles* and not laymen before him. Hence the priests alone have a right to the cup!" Oh! very well—so the priests are the successors of the apostles. But I think Holy Church is in the habit of asserting that the Bishops are the successors of the apostles, and so on that ground, the priests instead of drinking *all* the wine, have no right to touch any of it. They must leave it to my Lord the Bishop. He must drink all of it, because he has the regular apostolical succession, transmitted by Peter to Linus, and by Linus to Cletus or Clement, or some body else, and by some body else to some other person, until the Pope got hold of the chain, and handed the apostolical authority down, down to his successor, and his successor's successor, and so on to the present day. But now, we raise our watchword, "To the law and to the testimony—if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them!" Let us remember

the priests seek to justify their withholding of the cup from the laity, on the plea that when Christ instituted the sacrament of the supper, there were no laymen there—but apostles only. We presume the apostle Paul's authority will be deemed amply sufficient, and what does he say, 1 Cor. xi. 27—28? “Wherefore *whosoever* shall eat this bread *and drink this cup* of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a *man*,” (not let an apostle, a Bishop, a priest, but let a man, a private communicant,) “examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.” Here then it is plain that by the direction of the apostle Paul, Christians in the church at Corinth communed in both kinds, i. e. partook of the cup as well as of the bread. For this reason Paul says, 1 Cor. x. 16, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Paul says, “I received of the Lord that which I also delivered to you.” Of whom have the priests received their contradiction of the Lord's appointment? But here, I must call your attention to another instance of priestly fraud. Amongst the reasons assigned in the Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, for the validity of communion in one kind is the following.

“3dly, 1 Cor. xi. 27. Where the apostle declares, that whosoever receives under either kind unworthily, is guilty both of the body and blood of Christ, ‘Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the

Lord.' Where the Protestant translators have evidently corrupted the text by putting in *and* drink, instead of *or* drink, as it is in the original."

This is a deliberate and shameful untruth. The original word in Greek is *καί*, which commonly means *and*, and never means *or*! These Romans are rare Greek scholars, my readers. They first pervert the original text, and then, after perpetrating a base fraud, coolly charge it upon Protestant translators. And here I must brand another forgery, which has been deliberately effected by the Church of Rome in the service of the mass. The form of consecrating the cup is the following :

"In like manner, after supper, he took this noble chalice into his holy and adorable hands, and after thanks to the Father, he blessed," (here the priest crosses,) "and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take ye, and drink you *all* of this : for this is the cup of my blood, a new and everlasting testament, a mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins : so oft as you do this, you shall do it in remembrance of me."

Here the priests put words into the mouth of the Saviour which were not spoken by him. At the institution of the supper, Christ said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood ; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." This form, Paul tells us, "he received of the Lord ;" but the Papal church, besides otherwise materially modifying the form, has inserted the words, *a mystery of faith*. "This is the cup of my blood, a new and everlasting testament, a mystery of faith." The priests affirm a direct untruth whenever

they consecrate the cup, by asserting that Christ used this language, when they know he did no such thing. He never said, "this is the cup of my blood, a new and everlasting testament; *a mystery of faith.*" But in the next paragraph, we find the following :

Q. "*What is the reason why the Church does not give communion to all her children in both kinds ?*"

A. 1st, "Because of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, which could hardly be avoided, if all were to receive the cup. 2dly, Because, considering how soon wine decays, the sacrament could not well be kept for the sick in both kinds. 3dly, Because some constitutions can neither endure the taste nor smell of wine. 4thly, Because true wine in some countries is very hard to be met with. 5thly, In fine, in opposition to those heretics that deny that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind."

Very weighty reasons no doubt. 1. "Because of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, which could hardly be avoided if ALL were to receive the cup." If a drop of wine should be spilled out of the cup, it would be fearful sacrilege, according to the priests! But did not this same danger exist in the days of the apostles, and yet Christians all drank of the cup in their day, as we have shown ?

2ndly, "Because considering how soon wine decays, the sacrament could not well be kept for the sick in both kinds." But who commands you to keep the sacrament for the sick? This is a superstition of your own. 3dly, "Because some constitutions can neither endure the taste nor smell of wine." What a happy thing it is for the

priests that they are all blessed with constitutions which can endure both.

4thly, "Because true wine in some countries is very hard to be met with." In this case, I suppose we must be content to get the best that can be procured.

5thly, "In fine, in opposition to those heretics that deny that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind." A very weighty reason truly. The heretics affirm that the Bible enjoins communion in both kinds, *therefore* we assert the contrary. This is about as conclusive as the reasoning of one of the priests in Kensington, Father ———, who was a good deal annoyed by Rev. Mr. Cornwell's exposition of the absurdity of purgatory, and undertook to vindicate the doctrine of Holy Mother; and who is said to have concluded his sermon to this effect, "Well my brethren, if we cannot prove purgatory by the Bible, one thing is certain, we can prove it by the Council of Trent." But, we must proceed to examine the next proof offered in the Grounds of Catholic Doctrine.

Q. "*What other text of scripture do the fathers apply to the sacrifice of the Mass?*"

A. "The words of God in the first chapter of the prophet, Malachy, 10, 11, where rejecting the Jewish sacrifices, he declares his acceptance of that sacrifice or pure offering which should be made to him in every place among the Gentiles. 2dly, Those words of the Psalmist, Ps. cx. 4. "Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech:" Why according to the order of Melchisedech, say the holy fathers, but by reason of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, prefigured by that bread and wine offered by Melchisedech," Gen. xiv. 18.

The passage in Malachi i. 11, is: "From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place a *sacrifice* shall be offered in my name for a pure offering." This *sacrifice* is *the mass*, according to Romish theologians. But assertion is not proof. It is well known that the words *incense* and *sacrifice* are both figuratively used in the word of God to denote a purely *spiritual* oblation. Thus David says, "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." David had as much allusion to the mass in this prayer, as Malachi had in his prediction. So again Rev. v. 8, we read; "the four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." Here the prayers of God's people are compared to incense, signifying that they are sweet and acceptable to God. The prophecy of Malachi adduced as a proof text for the mass is literally fulfilled, for wherever Christ has a church, "from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, the pure offering," and the incense of prayer ascend to the mercy-seat. We do not need the smoking incense of Antichrist, nor the unbloody sacrifice of the mass to guide us to the fulfilment of this prophecy, for the incense and the mass of Rome are a smoke in Jehovah's nostrils, and an abomination in his sight.

But an allusion is made to Melchisedec, and the Holy Fathers tell us that the sacrifice of the mass was prefigured by the bread and wine, which Melchisedec offered to Abraham. The facts to which reference is made are

recorded in Gen. xiv. 18-20. Hence, when the Psalmist says, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec," he affords a warrant for the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass. To this we reply.

1. It is not true that this bread and wine constituted a sacrifice. It is expressly said, "he brought forth bread and wine;" not, he *sacrificed* them. He entertained Abraham and his servants, by giving them refreshment when they were weary.

2. If this act of Melchisedec was a sacrifice, as the priests tell us, to whom was it offered? Certainly not to God. If it was a sacrifice, then it must have been offered as a propitiation, an expiation, an atonement, and if so, a living victim was required. Did Melchisedec transubstantiate the bread and wine, and change them into the body and blood, bones, sinews and nerves, soul and divinity of the Messiah? But the Messiah was not yet come, and consequently as yet had not a body. Did Melchisedec sacrifice to Abraham? If so, he was not a priest of the Most High God, but a rank idolater. Besides are we not told that Abraham gave him tithes of all? And does not the apostle infer from this act, that Abraham acknowledged his inferiority to Melchisedec? And how shall Melchisedec then offer *sacrifice* to one inferior to himself? Hence this offering of bread and wine could not have been a sacrifice, and consequently it has nothing to do with the mass.

I have now reviewed the scriptural proofs which are adduced in support of the mass, which our good old Heidelberg Catechism declares "is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ,

and an accursed idolatry," to which we respond Amen! and shall prove that the language of our book, strong as it is, is fully authorized.

We affirm that "the mass is a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ," because it is a direct, open, bold and blasphemous contradiction of the plainest Scripture. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews is full of the most pointed passages which could have been penned against this Antichristian institution. He declares not merely once or twice, but with most emphatic repetition that Christ need not offer himself, or be offered *often*, but that the offering *once* made is sufficient to the end of time. In Hebrews ix. 24-28, we read as follows, "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; (for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world;) but now *ONCE* in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men *ONCE* to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was *ONCE* offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." And again Hebrews x. 10, 12, 14. "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *ONCE*. But this man, after he had offered *ONE* sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; for by *ONE* offering he hath perfected *FOR EVER* them that are sanctified."

Is it possible for the living God to express his mind respecting the oblation of Christ more plainly than it is here revealed? He says, and remember it is *God* who speaks in this volume,—*He* proclaims in his word, “Christ has been offered *ONCE* ;” “by this *ONE* offering he has forever perfected them which are sanctified.” By this *ONE* sacrifice he has come to put away sin, and consequently all further necessity of sacrifice is obviated. The great sacrifice on Calvary was the Antitype of all the Jewish victims slain upon the altars of the old covenant. Jesus was the substance of which they were the shadows, and when he offered himself as the Lamb of God, it was as a propitiation for the sins of the world—all sufficient to the end of time. But now contrast with this plain exposition of the simple testimony of Scripture the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome. She tells us first, that “in the Mass, there is offered to God, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead !” And when she tells us this, she contradicts the Holy Ghost, for he declares that the expiation offered by Christ can *NEVER* be repeated ! Christ himself affirms it. Ere he bowed his head and expired on the cross, he exclaimed, “It is finished ;” thus proclaiming to the world that every atonement necessary for our salvation was accomplished in his death ! And yet the priests of Antichrist are daily offering up Christ again. They change a morsel of bread into “the body and blood, &c,” and then eat their breadden God, as a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Every time they say mass, they make an addition to Christ’s sacrifice, as though it were imperfect without their aid. But the priests tell us, these are not various

or different sacrifices, but only a repetition of that one sacrifice. But does not Paul, through his whole argument, contend that this sacrifice was offered once, and is never to be repeated? But Antichrist rejoins: "the mass is not a repetition of that sacrifice, but an application of it." We reply, Christ offered himself not that his sacrifice might be daily ratified by new oblations, but that its benefits might be communicated through the preaching of the gospel, and the administration of the sacred supper. Hence Paul says, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," and commands us to feast on him by faith, and thus secure the benefits of his death. No! my brethren, the mass is not an acceptable sacrifice. It expunges from the memory the true and alone death of Christ. It substitutes a new offering for the Saviour. For, as the apostle argues, among men the confirmation of a testament depends on the death of the testator, so also our Lord by his death, has confirmed the testament in which he has given us remission of sins and everlasting righteousness. Now the mass is a new and a different testament. Every time mass is offered, a new remission of sins is promised by the Priest, so then there are as many different testaments or wills, as there are masses. If so, Christ must come again as often as the mass is celebrated, and, by another death, confirm each one of these innumerable testaments, which according to Scripture are of no force until after the death of the testator.

But the priests tell us the mass is an unbloody sacrifice offered for the remission of sins! Then by the very terms it is no avail. For what saith the Scripture? Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins! If the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice, there must be a

shedding of blood ; but there is avowedly none, therefore it can make no atonement.

The mass is the ship at sea, of the Romish Church. There is nothing which brings in so much revenue to Antichrist as the mass. If a soul is to be fetched out of purgatory, the mass is the thing that can do it; and every mass has its price. The Redeemer of the world is offered up at so much a time, and he is sacrificed for the most trivial purposes; not only to bring souls out of purgatorial fire, but to procure a prosperous journey, or deliverance from danger, or recovery from sickness, or for any other object I believe, whenever the good *Catholic* is willing to pay down the price of the mass. The amount of money which is filched out of the poor Irish papists by their priests is incredible. I have before me some authentic documents, which I will quote by way of illustrating this assertion. See *McGavin*, vol. i. p. 478.

"Oct. 17th, 1798.—An account of the masses said for the soul of the late Mrs. Monaghan :—

St. James' Chapel,	50 masses	- -	£2 14 2
Denmark St. Chapel,	20	- - - -	1 1 8
Stephen St. Chapel,	20	- - - -	1 1 8
Ash St. Chapel,	20	- - - -	1 1 8

110 masses, - - £5 19 2

Received the above, in full, this 17th Oct. 1798.

M. M'Guire."

"Dublin, July 11th, 1809.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds three shillings and fourpence, for twenty masses, offered up by the Rev. Gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mr. Timothy Mahon.

£2. 3s. 4d.

Jas. Jos. Callan."

"12th Oct. 1809.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds three and fourpence, for twenty masses, said by the Rev. Gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the soul of Mrs. Mary Monaghan. Jas. Jos. Callan."

"Dublin, Oct. 31st.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, three pounds eight and threepence, for sixty masses, offered up in St. James' Chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mrs. Monaghan.

£3. 8s. 3d.

Jas. Jos. Callan."

I dare say some of my Roman Catholic readers have such receipts at home. Now I suppose the mass priests will not hesitate to affirm that this is all right, but one thing is certain, either they are wrong, or the apostle Peter was guilty of a gross error in reproving Simon Magus. When the Sorcerer wished to purchase the gift of God with money, "thy money perish with thee!" was the indignant rebuke of the apostle. Oh! if he had been a Pope, or a popish priest either, he would not have refused Simon Magus' offer! Not he! The answer would have been, "pay me so much, and you shall have it!" Or like Judas, "how much will you give me, and I will betray him?" Of all empirics, spiritual quacks are the worst, and of all spiritual impostors, the mass-priests, who openly boast that they can create their own Creator, are the most contemptible! The gross absurdity of transubstantiation originates a thousand consequences which are as ridiculous as their parent. The Roman missal gives the following cautions respecting the celebration of the mass.

"Mass may be deficient in the matter, in the form, and in the minister. First, in the matter. If the bread be not of wheat, or if there be so great a mixture of other

grain that it cannot be called wheat bread, or if in any way corrupted, it does not make a sacrament. If it be maed with rose-water, or any other distilled water, it is doubtful whether it makes a sacrament or not. Though corruption have begun, or though it be leavened, it makes a sacrament, but the celebrator sins grievously.

“If the celebrator, before consecration, observes that the host is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must still take another and swallow it, after which, he must also swallow the first, or give it another, or preserve it with reverence.”

“If any remains of meat, sticking in the mouth, be swallowed with the host, they do not prevent communicating, provided they be swallowed, not as meat, but as spittle. The same is to be said, if, in washing the mouth, a drop of water be swallowed, provided it be against our will.”

“If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament; for example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins; if there be no wax candles; if it be not celebrated between daybreak and noon; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds; or if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes; if these robes and the napkins be not blessed by a bishop; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve—a woman, for example; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold, or silver, or pewter; if the vestment be not of clean linen, adorned with silk in the middle, and blessed by a bishop; if the priest celebrate with his head covered; if there be no missal present, though he have it by heart.

“If a gnat or spider fall into the cup, after the conse-

cration, the priest must swallow it with the blood, if he can; otherwise, let him take it out, wash it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings on holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, and remain till it be dry, then be burned, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted.

“If the blood freeze in winter, put warm cloths about the cup; if that be not sufficient, put the cup in boiling water. If any of Christ’s blood fall upon the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, and the place scraped; the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground.

“If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the species do not appear entire, let the vomit be burnt, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground.”

To these extracts we append the following, taken also from the Roman Missal :

“If the consecrated host (or wafer) disappear, being taken away by some accident as by the wind, or a miracle, or a mouse, or any other animal, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated; and let that animal, if he can be taken, be killed and burned, and his ashes cast into consecrated ground, or under the altar.”

In close connection with this extract from the Missal approved by the Council of Trent; we will quote one of the canons of this same council. Sess. xii. can. 3. “If any one shall deny that the WHOLE CHRIST is contained

in the venerable sacrament, under each species, and when a separation is made, UNDER EACH PARTICLE OF THIS SPECIES, let him be accursed."

Now we ask our readers to ponder this horrible absurdity for a moment, before they pass their verdict upon it. If a MOUSE divides that wafer into a thousand particles, each one of those crumbs contains the entire body and blood, soul and divinity of Christ. Every nibble of the little creature's teeth creates new Deities, and hundreds of the gods of Rome may be confined in the stomach of a single mouse! Then think of the priest looking for the Saviour of the world in his own vomit! We shudder at the thought that human beings have dared to propagate these filthy blasphemies, which are surely enough to make devils blush.

And now my Roman Catholic reader remember, Christ cannot be insulted with impunity! He will enter into judgment with them who crucify their Lord afresh, and put him to an open shame! And if there are any who shall more than others feel the power of Jehovah's anger, surely they cannot escape the fury of his indignation, who set at nought his counsel, and rear their idols upon the very altars of his sanctuary. You may plead that your priests have deceived you, but that plea will not avail. Your ignorance is wilful, and you are without excuse; you have the Bible, and you can read it. You have your reason, and you can use it. You have the promise of heavenly direction, and you can ask for it. If deceived, you are deceived in the face of reason, against the evidence of your senses, the testimony of experience, and the voice of conscience; above all, you are deceived in the very light of God's holy word, which





1

2

3

4

forbids and condemns the mass. If you persist in your delusion, and go on seeking salvation and remission of sins from the mass, until you die, so sure as God lives, you will sink into the perdition of the ungodly, and perish without remedy!

P E N A N C E .

AND THEY WENT OUT AND PREACHED THAT MEN SHOULD
REPENT.—Mark vi. 12.

This passage is in the Doway Bible, rendered, "And going forth they preached that they should DO PENANCE." Penance is enumerated among the sacraments of the Romish Church, and is defined in her authorized publications, *as the confession of sins with a sincere repentance, and the priest's absolution*, or as "a sacrament of the new law, by which absolution of sins is given by a priest having jurisdiction, to baptized persons who have relapsed, are contrite and have made confession." Penance is usually regarded as consisting of three parts in respect to the penitent, viz. contrition, confession and satisfaction, and on the part of the priest, absolution, when he has reason to believe the penitent comes with the proper disposition. We may as well state at the very outset, our general reasons for refusing this peculiar feature of the Romish system, a place amongst the sacraments. Strictly speaking, penance is punishment, or ecclesiastical correction. But upon what principle can *correction* be regarded as a sacrament? If every species only of ecclesiastical correction be a sacrament, then we have not merely *seven* sacraments, but seventy times seven. It may be objected that penance ought not to be regarded properly speaking as punishment, but rather as penitence. Be

it so. But what then? Penitence is certainly a good thing, but there are many good things that are not sacraments. If penitence be a sacrament, why are not faith, hope and charity, which are sometimes termed theological virtues, elevated to the same rank? And why are not all the graces which adorn the renewed mind—all the fruits of the Spirit, sacraments? Being penitent is no more sacramental than to be pious or moral. And besides, according to an approved definition, "a sacrament is a visible sign of a sacred thing." But where is the visible sign in the sacrament of penance? This difficulty suggested itself to the minds of the renowned doctors who constituted the famous council of Trent, and they therefore called *contrition*, *confession* and *satisfaction*, the matter "AS IT WERE" of this sacrament. But we cannot be satisfied with an "as it were," when we require a "thus saith the Lord," and an actual and visible sign, such as we have in baptism and the Lord's Supper. There is no symbol in penance, and therefore it cannot be a sacrament. But there is another general argument which to my mind furnishes a satisfactory vindication of the Protestant doctrine of *two* sacraments, and shows in a manner a priore, the unreasonableness not to say downright absurdity of characterizing the five additional ceremonies of the Church of Rome, as sacraments. All the spiritual blessings which are required and conferred upon man on earth may be reduced to two, viz. justification and sanctification. He needs acquittal and pardon; these he has secured to him in justification, and he requires *holiness*, for without this no man shall see the Lord. The things signified being two, the signs need

not be seven, or six, or four, or three ; more than two are not requisite. The spiritual gifts which flow to us from the Father of Lights are all reducible to the two great blessings of the new covenant, already specified, and consequently as neither of them requires more than one type, two symbols are sufficient to represent them, and more than two would be redundant and superfluous, if not unreasonable. As there are but two things signified, pardon and purity, acquittal and holiness, let the signs be but two, the Lord's supper and baptism. We do not need more than two sacraments. There are but these two great spiritual blessings already specified, therefore let there be two sacraments which shall be emblematical of them. Now it is well known that the Lord's supper is a sign of our pardon or justification before God for the sake of Christ's merits, and baptism is the type of holiness or sanctification, which is represented under the figure of washing or sprinkling. In the one sacrament, we are assured that as truly as the bread is broken before our eyes, and the wine poured out into the cup, so surely was the body of Christ, our great sacrifice broken on the cross for us, and his blood poured out as the price of our acquittal ; and in the other we are reminded that as truly as the application of water cleanses the body, so surely is the soul of the believer cleansed from all filthiness of the Spirit through the sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost. Thus the two great blessings of the new covenant are typified in its two sacraments. Now of what other spiritual gifts are the *seven* sacraments of the Romish church the types ? We believe the advocates of this number will themselves be at a loss to determine what *additional*

blessings are intended by the five ceremonies upon which the papal church has conferred a sacramental character.

The doctrine of the Romish church respecting penance, contains two prominent and fundamental errors ; the first is, that the *penitent has power to make satisfaction to God for his sins* by confession to a priest, and by the exact performance of certain austerities or penances enjoined by his ghostly counsellor, and the second is that the *priest as Christ's vicar has power to absolve him*. These two pernicious and fatal errors, we shall now proceed to examine and expose in detail. That these tenets are held will be sufficiently evident to my readers by a reference to the 9th, 10th, and 13th, and 14th canons of the œcumenical council of Trent, which are as follows. (Dens, p. 441.)

“Whoever shall say, that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a mere ministry to pronounce and declare, that sins are remitted to the person making confession, provided that he only believes that he is absolved, even though the priest should not absolve seriously, but in joke : or shall say, that the confession of a penitent is not requisite, in order that the priest may absolve him ; let him be accursed !

“Whoever shall say, that priests who are living in mortal sin do not possess the power of binding and loosing : or that the priests are not the only ministers of absolution, but that it was said to all and every one of Christ's faithful : *Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven ; and*

whose sins you shall retain, they are retained : by virtue of which words, any one may forgive sins ; public sins, by reproof only, if the offender shall acquiesce ; and private sins, by voluntary confession ; let him be accursed !

“ Whoever shall say that satisfaction is by no means made to God, through Christ’s merits, for sins as to their temporal penalty, by punishments inflicted by him, and patiently borne, or enjoined by the priests, though not undergone voluntarily, as fasting, prayers, alms, or also other works of piety, and therefore that the best penance is nothing more than a new life ; let him be accursed !

“ Whoever shall say that the satisfaction by which penitents redeem themselves from sin through Jesus Christ, are no part of the service of God, but traditions of men, obscuring the doctrine concerning grace, and the true worship of God, and the actual benefit of Christ’s death ; let him be accursed !

1. As to the first that *the penitent has power to make satisfaction to God for his sins by confession to a priest, and by the exact performance of penances by him imposed*, we affirm that it is utterly unauthorized by any passage of Scripture, and is decidedly opposed to the whole letter and spirit of the gospel. The word *penance* itself is a gross perversion when applied to any act recommended in the word of God, and yet the translators of the Douay Bible, the version, which the priests graciously permit some of their people to read, but with the express proviso, that they must not exercise their private judgment, but receive the interpreta-

tion which the pastors of the church affix to it," I say, the translators of the Douay Bible with a courage, which would be commendable were it not exhibited in the propagation of falsehood, have actually recorded such sentences as the following as part of the counsel of God. "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the desert of Judæa, and saying, *do penance* for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. 3, 1, 2,) And again, "And going forth they preached that men should *do penance*." (Mark 6, 12.) "I say to you, unless you *do penance* you shall all likewise perish." (Luke 13, 3,) "Nay, father Abraham, but if one went to them from the dead, they will *do penance*." (Luke 16, 13.) In all these cases and in a great many more too numerous to mention in detail, the phrase, "*do penance*" is substituted for the word repent!" Then again we have in Matt. 3, 8, the following: "Bring forth, therefore, fruit worthy of *penance*;" and again, (Mark 4,) "John was in the desert preaching the baptism of *penance*," and again, (Luke 15, 7,) "I say to you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that *doth penance*, more than upon ninety and nine just persons who need not penance." And these veracious translators make the Saviour's commission to his apostles run thus—(Luke 24, 47) "That *penance* and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." And accordingly we read, (Acts 20, 21.) That Paul says, "Testifying both to Jews and Gentiles *penance* towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." And they make the good apostle declare, (2 Cor. 7, 9.) "I am glad that

you were made sorrowful *unto penance*." In his epistle to the Romans (2, 4,) they put this sentence into his mouth, "Knowest thou that the benignity of God leadeth thee to *penance*?" The object of these and similar perversions is very evident. The Douay Bible is put into the hands of those Roman Catholics, who have attained to such years of discretion that they may reasonably be expected to let the priests think for them on religious subjects, and avoid putting a construction upon any passage of Scripture different from that which the church teaches, and even then the privilege of searching even the Douay Scriptures is granted reluctantly. Now the simple Roman Catholic as he turns over its pages finds *penance* enjoined by Christ and his apostles, and wonders how Protestant ministers can have the audacity to assert that penance is an invention of the Romish church. Why here it is in *the Bible* that angels rejoice, when "a sinner does penance," and that Paul was glad, when the Corinthians were made "sorrowful unto penance;" and that John the Baptist, and Christ began their ministry by commanding men *to do penance*! Now one of two things is certain. Either the priests are egregiously ignorant of the meaning of the terms *μετανοειν* and *μεταμελλειν* the only two Greek verbs which are used to denote the act of repentance, or they wilfully endorse a false interpretation, in order to deceive their people. *Metanoia* refers exclusively to a mental or a moral act; it means literally, *a change of mind*, and never in one single instance does it designate anything which can be construed as authority for the Popish absurdity of *penance*. The word *repentance*, in its primary signification,

indicates precisely the meaning of the original word *Metanoia*; it is derived from the French word *penser*, "to think," with the prefix *re*, denoting repetition; thus we have as the etymological meaning of "repentance," "*thinking again*." From its very derivation, therefore, it is plain that to render the word *Metanoia*, by *penance*, is a gross perversion. The term *penance* is derived from the Latin word *pæna*, which means *punishment*, a signification which the Greek word *metanoia* never had, and never will have, except in the perverted understanding of men, whose interest it is to keep their poor dupes in that ignorance which they facetiously term the *mother of devotion*! In some passages, the word *metanoia* is rendered *repentance* in the Douay Bible, for the manifest reason that the substitution of *penance* would present a meaning which would offend a devout *Catholic* reader. For instance, in Acts xi. 18., we read, "When they had heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, God then hath also to the Gentiles given *repentance* unto life; *penance unto life* would not do; *penance unto death* would be nearer the Romish doctrine. And again—"For the gifts and calling of God are without *repentance*;" i. e. God does not change his mind respecting either his gifts or calling. If the original words had in this instance been rendered *penance*, though it would have been a mistranslation, yet that would at all events have declared an important truth; for the gifts and calling of God are certainly without *penance*; but if this had been asserted in the Douay Bible, the poor Papist would probably not have been so willing to go without his breakfast, or to wear a hair

cloth girdle next his skin, at the bidding of his confessor ; and so in this case, the original is correctly rendered by the word *repentance* ; and in a note the commentator very properly interprets the import of the text to be, *that God's promises are unchangeable* ; thus showing that *he* at least knew that *penance* was not the proper correspondent term to the Greek original. There is another gross incongruity in the Douay Bible, which but for the wickedness of its design, would be perfectly ludicrous. Roman theologians teach that "the sacraments of the new law are seven, to wit: Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, PENANCE, Extreme Unction, Orders and Matrimony. The primary reason of this is the will of Christ as made known by divine tradition." (Dens, p. 138). *Scripture* certainly is not the medium through which the divine will, that there should be *seven* sacraments, has been made known. But now observe, *penance* is here declared to be a sacrament of the *new* law, instituted by Christ. Hence of course according to their own creed, the priests date the institution of *penance*, as commencing subsequent to the birth of Christ. But if we turn to the Old Testament, we find in the Douay Bible such passages as these (Jeremiah 31. 19.) "After thou didst convert me, I DID PENANCE." What ! *Jeremiah* did penance !! And again, (Jer. 8. 6.) "I attended and hearkened ; no man speaketh what is good, there is none that *doeth penance* for his sin !" Here then, we see that *penance* must have been a sacrament of the old law ; for we find a prophet declaring that when the Lord converted him, *he* did penance ; and complaining that those to whom he preached would *not do penance* ;

though according to Roman Catholic theologians, the sacrament of penance was not instituted till more than 600 years after the prophet uttered his complaint!! And what is worse than all, the Douay translators make the blessed Saviour himself declare, "The men of Ninevah shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; because THEY DID PENANCE at the preaching of Jonas!" That is, THEY DID PENANCE precisely 862 years before the birth of Christ, who according to Romish theologians, instituted the *divine sacrament* in question! To such gross inconsistencies are men reduced when they attempt to sustain a system of deception and fraud!

I have, I think, sufficiently proved that the *term* penance has no right to appear on the pages of God's word; and I shall now show that the acts of penance enjoined by priests upon their penitents, and performed with a view to make satisfaction to divine justice, cannot from their very nature be acceptable to God.

The Scriptures of the New Testament uniformly attest this as a settled principle that men cannot satisfy the claims of God's justice by their own works. Satisfaction for the sins of believers has been made by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross. Sinners are not justified by their own personal righteousness, but by the righteousness of their great substitute and surety, in whose merits they trust and in whom they believe. "We are saved by grace through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God." The primary and principal sense of the word "grace" is unmerited favor. In the writings of Paul, it is used in contradistinction to works and worthiness of every kind or degree. Thus he

argues—"Now to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of *grace*, but of debt, therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace." "For by grace are ye saved—not of works, lest any man should boast." And again—"Who hath saved us, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace." Rom. iv. 4. 16.; Eph. ii. 8; 2 Tim. i. 9. Of course, from the primary signification of *grace*, it supposes unworthiness in its object, for just so soon as any degree of actual merit is proved, the province of grace ceases, and that of *equity* begins. Hence the apostle says, "If by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more of grace, otherwise work is no more of work." Rom. xi. 6. Add to this, that when the word of God describes the subjects of divine grace, it speaks of them not only as having no claim to any of the blessings of salvation, but as having merited the very reverse; it represents them as under a fearful curse, and justly exposed to everlasting wo and death! How does this comport with the doctrine of the Papal church, that satisfaction is made to God through Christ's merits for sins as to their temporal penalty, by punishments inflicted by him, and patiently borne, or enjoined by the priest, though not undergone voluntarily, as fastings, prayers, alms, or also other works of piety?" The plea that penances inflicted by the priest and patiently borne by the penitent, make satisfaction to God *through Christ's merits*, is a miserable subterfuge, and the Papist who advances it, may easily be reduced to a dilemma. For, either the merits of Christ are alone sufficient to satisfy for all temporal and

eternal guilt, or they are not. If Christ's merits are sufficient, then it is plain that works of satisfaction are unnecessary; and if they are insufficient, then the Holy Spirit has erred in declaring that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from ALL sin," because it surely does not cleanse from *all* sin, if prayers, and alms, and masses, and fastings, and austerities are requisite to make a part of this satisfaction!

The absurdity of these works of satisfaction, will be still more apparent if we inquire somewhat more closely into their nature. In commenting on the sacramental satisfactions enjoined by the Council of Trent, Dens remarks that all works of satisfaction may be reduced to these three kinds—*prayer, fasting and alms giving*. He then adds, "lest a confessor who is a novice, should perhaps be at a loss to know what he must enjoin as satisfaction, we here subjoin the individual works of satisfaction now practised in the church." They are the following:

1. "To say five *Pater Noster*, and *Ave Maria*, in memory of Christ's five wounds, either on his bended knees, or with extended arms, or before a crucifix.

2. "To recite the rosary, or litanies of the blessed Virgin Mary, or of the Saints, &c.

3. "To read the psalm *Miserere* (51st.) or seven penitential psalms.

4. "To hear masses, or lauds, or *preaching*.

5. "To read a chapter in Thomas a Kempis.

6. "To visit the churches to pray before the tabernacle.

7. "At stated times, early, at evening, or through the

day, or as often as they hear the sound of the bell, to repeat orally or in the heart, ejaculatory prayers, acts of contrition, or of charity : v. g. I love thee, O God, above all things ; I detest all my sins : I will sin no more : Jesus, crucified for me, have mercy upon me.

8. "On the appointed day to confess again, or at least to return to the confessor.

To the class of *fasting* is referred everything which pertains to the mortification of the body : thus either a perfect fast, or a part of a fast, may be enjoined ; v. g.

1. "Let him fast on the sixth day of the week, or oftener.

2. "Let him fast only till twelve o'clock.

3. "Let him not drink before noon, or after noon, except at dinner or supper, although he may be thirsty : let him abstain from wine and strong beer.

4. "Let him eat less, at evening let him take only half a meal.

"The above mentioned abstinences are properly imposed on workmen, because they may be connected with labour, because otherwise they are wont to excuse themselves on account of their work. St. Jerome confirms the same, when he says, *scanty food, and a stomach ever hungry, is better than a three days' fast.*

5. "Let him rise out of bed earlier : let him kneel more frequently and for a longer time : let him endure cold : at a certain time let him observe silence : let him abstain from games and from recreations, &c.

"To the class of *alms* is reduced whatever is expended for the advantage of a neighbor : v. g.

1. "To make presents of money, clothes, food, &c.

2. "To afford personal helps, to wait upon the sick, to pray for the conversion of sinners, &c., and works of any other mercy, whether corporeal or spiritual." (No. 176.)

From this it appears that acts of worship and devotion are *punishments* in the estimation of a Roman Catholic. He repeats an extra number of prayers, or he reads certain portions of Scripture by way of expiation for his sins! He goes to hear his priest preach as a punishment for his transgressions! What a compliment the priests pay to themselves and to one another, when they regard their people as making satisfaction, i. e. voluntarily enduring punishment in listening to their eloquent harangues on purgatory and the evils of private judgment! And what are we to think of a religion, whose votaries are taught to regard prayer, and the reading of the Scriptures as punishments, those acts of devotion in which the Christian delights to engage? Show me the passage in which the word of God represents prayer in any other light than the *privilege* of the child of God? Is the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father, given to us as a punishment? Can we make satisfaction for our sins by holding communion with God, and by meditating upon his word? My brethren, in this simple fact, that Roman Catholics are taught to regard prayer and reading the Scriptures as punishments, have we not evidence clear as the sun-light, that they are totally ignorant of the very first principles of experimental piety? And is it possible for Satan more effectually to pervert these means of grace, than he has done by converting them into

penitential drudgeries? Surprise is sometimes expressed that Popery as a system should produce fruit which bears at least the semblance of piety and love; but when it is remembered that the Roman Catholic gives alms as an atonement for his sins; and that his liberality is a *penance*, we need not wonder at it. "The Lord loveth a *cheerful* giver." I leave those who give alms in order to make satisfaction for their sins, and who must therefore "give grudgingly and of necessity," to infer from that how much their charity is worth in the sight of heaven!

But I would not have my readers suppose that satisfaction is always made so easily as these penitential specimens would indicate. The more holy among the saints have practised austerities of a very different character from the mere repetition of a stipulated number of Pater Nosters and Ave Marias. St. Dominick v. g., the illustrious founder of the Holy Inquisition, (within whose gloomy cells men have been gibbeted, and screwed, and racked, and roasted, under the merciful direction of apostolical inquisitors), this St. Dominick, who, as the founder of such an institution, must needs have been a precious babe of grace, was in the habit of rising from his cradle when an infant, and lying on the cold ground, by way of penance; as the sins for which his penance was performed are not specified, it is probable St. Dominick, at this early age, began to perform *works of supererogation*. St. Francis, Cardinal Bonaventure tells us, used to call his body, Brother Ass, because of the comfortable whippings, and the coarse fare which he dispensed to his outer man. He was in the habit of sprinkling ashes

over his food. Had he done the same with the ass's provender, the animal would probably have left the whole mess to his master. St. Ignatius, the Father of the Jesuits, was another very holy man, and he had need be so, when his children are so hopeful a family. This saint, if we may believe his biographers, used to carry an iron chain round his body instead of a common girdle, and besides wearing a comfortable hair shirt, he was accustomed to whip himself soundly three times a day. I am disposed to believe that the founder of the Jesuits richly deserved all the whippings he ever got, judging him by the brethren of the same fraternity. The Rom. Brev. tells us that St. Patrick was in the habit of lying on the cold stones in the open air. He daily repeated 150 psalms, making 300 genuflections, his right hand performing 800 motions in the sign of the cross. The night with him was divided into three parts; one-third he spent on his knees, one-third he devoted to sleep, and the other third he stood immersed in cold water! These are specimens of the penances endured by eminent saints to make satisfaction to God for their sins. The Hindoo devotees, who keep their arms extended in one position until the power of the muscles is destroyed, and the poor creatures who prostrate themselves before the car of Juggernaut, and are crushed under its ponderous wheels, should, on the same principle, be entered on the saintly calendar of the Romish church.

Many of my readers have no doubt heard of a place in Ireland where penance is performed, an island in Lough Dearg, known as the station, or Patrick's Pur-

gatory! To this place of penance a multitude of deluded devotees repair. The first thing the pilgrim does when he gets in sight of the lake is to prostrate himself, kiss the earth, and then on his knees offer up three paters and aves, for the favor of being permitted to see this blessed place. This over, he is rowed across by the ferryman. After reaching the island and making renewed obeisances, he begins the stations, i. e. he walks bare-foot from east to west along a pavement of stone spikes, every footstep torturing his nerves from his feet to his brain. The crowd press on, praying, elbowing, jostling, and scrambling, and wailing from pain. The penance begins at St. Patrick's "beds," which are sharp stones placed circularly in the earth, with the spike ends of them up, one circle in another, and over each one of these circles which gradually decrease in circumference, each one being less than its predecessor, the penitent goes, repeating Ave Marias and Pater Nosters, usually in the proportion of ten prayers to the Virgin to one to God. Over and over these beds, the victims of Papal delusion walk with a patience and endurance unwearied, until the discipline is complete. No later than 1840, this purgatory was in full vigor, and I know that not a few of my readers have seen the place and witnessed the scenes I have described. This is a Popish means of grace! Thus the blind followers of the Man of Sin are made holy! Of the sanctifying influence of this purgatory, I can of course say nothing from personal observation, but I may state to my readers on the authority of a friend, that a poor Roman Catholic who had been to the

station, was heard by himself declaring *with an oath*, that since he had been at Lough Dearg, *he was so holy that he could not bear to hear a man swear.*

II. *I proceed to consider the second fundamental error, which is involved in the Romish sacrament of penance, viz : that the priest as Christ's vicar in the court of conscience, has power judicially to absolve the penitent.* In proof that this prerogative is granted to the bishops and priests of the church, an argument is sometimes adduced from analogy. Baptism, it is affirmed, is the sacrament by which all original and actual sins are cancelled ; but as we are continually falling into sin, some other divine institution is requisite, by which the sins committed after baptism may be removed, and this is afforded in the sacrament of penance. But the premises from which this inference is drawn are erroneous, and the conclusion itself, even supposing that the premises were correct, amounts to a mere possibility, or at the utmost to a meagre probability ; and this is a point for which we demand proof. The case of the man, sick with the palsy, whom Christ restored, is sometimes adduced as evidence that the priests have power to forgive sin. The circumstances were these : Jesus said to the sick man, "Son be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee." The Scribes secretly accused the Saviour of blasphemy ; he knew their thoughts, turned to them and said, "Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts ? For whether is it easier to say, thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, arise and walk ? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy) arise, take up thy bed

and go unto thine house ; and he arose and departed to his house. But when the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God which had given *such power unto men,*" i. e. the power of forgiving sins. From this it is inferred that the priests have power to forgive sins. I shall be perfectly willing to believe that they have, if they will sustain *their* claim in the same or a similar way with the Saviour. I shall be ready to admit that I occupy the place of the cavilling scribe, and that they are the vicars of Christ in the court of conscience, if they will establish their authority as Jesus Christ proved his. "That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, then saith he to the sick of the palsy, "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine own house, and he arose and departed to his house." Here the Saviour in fact intimates that in order to establish his claim, the exercise of miraculous power was requisite. "*That ye may know*" that I have authority to forgive sins, I heal this man who is sick of the palsy." Therefore, that we may know that the Popish priests have power to forgive sins, let them perform a real miracle, one that shall be evident to the senses of a sound Protestant—not one of their *hocus pocus* tricks, but a substantial, plain and incontrovertible miracle, and we will believe that their reverences have power to forgive sins. And I will venture to say that a fairer opportunity of making proselytes never has been afforded than at the present time. Just let us know when these reverend gentlemen are willing to submit the validity of their title to this prerogative, to a practical test, and I dare say our hospitals will afford some subjects upon whom they may

exercise their healing power ; and if in the presence of any congregation of heretics, they will restore those who are sick with the palsy, to health, I think it will be high time for us to repent of our temerity in questioning their spiritual authority. Until they do this, we shall on their own terms be justified in regarding them as practising gross imposition. But let us examine their Scripture proofs a little farther.

“ Q. *What do you mean by the sacrament of penance?* ”

“ A. The confession of sins with a sincere repentance, and the priest’s absolution.

“ Q. *What scripture have you to prove, that the bishops and priests of the church have power to absolve the sinner that confesses his sins with a sincere repentance?* ”

“ A. John 23 v. 22, 23. ‘Receive ye the Holy Ghost : whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them : and whose sins ye retain, they are retained. Matt. 18. v. 18. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven : and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.’ ” (Grounds of Catholic Doctrine.)

But these passages prove only that the apostles were all endowed with equal power. Christ had used the same words to Peter, (Matt. 16, 19;) he repeats them here as if expressly to show that he had not given Peter any supremacy over his brethren, or any exclusive authority to regulate the affairs of the church. The Saviour confers upon them the special illumination of the Holy Spirit, in order that they may be qualified to exercise discipline in the church ; and having given to them the infallible guidance of the Holy Ghost, he declares

that God's approval shall follow their acts of discipline ; that whatsoever they bind and loose on earth, shall be ratified in heaven. " Well," the priests rejoins, " we have the true apostolical succession—the authority which Christ gave to his apostles has been transmitted to our church ; the bishops have the same power as the apostles, and they give the Holy Spirit to the priest at his ordination ; thus he too has power to bind and to loose, and so we entangle you in the noose of your own argument." But we ask for the proof that this interpretation is the true one. The apostles were prepared to furnish evidence that they had received this extraordinary power, though they did not pretend to forgive sins judicially ; though they exercised no more than a declaratory power, yet to show that their declarations were in accordance with the mind of the Holy Spirit, they were empowered to work miracles. Like the Saviour, they healed the sick, they raised the dead, and they performed acts, which were incontestibly superhuman, the Holy Ghost thus bearing them witness. Now does the Holy Spirit bear this witness to the priests ? We want no " lying wonders" here ; we ask not for a recital of any of the legends which are published in this city about St. Francis and St. Ignatius, and St. Aloysius, &c. ; we want no *crab* stories ; we want no such marvellous tales as are told about St. Patrick, or his *goat* either ; but we want the evidence of our own senses, to convince us that the priests can work miracles such as the apostles wrought, and then we will yield the point and set about doing penance in good earnest ; we will try to make satisfaction for our sacriligious presumption in questioning the

powers of the reverend gentlemen, who profess to be clothed with apostolical authority! But we repeat it, until the priests meet us on this ground, we shall certainly be justified in denouncing their claim as impudent and absurd. And here I must remind them of another admission which is fatal to their theory. Not a single one of them will deny that he may be deceived by those who make confession to him. If his penitents choose to conceal any mortal sin, he can know nothing about it; the very necessity of auricular confession is a standing refutation of the arrogant claim of the priests to apostolic succession, for in the government of the church, the apostles had the infallible direction of the Holy Spirit, and whether men made confession or not, they knew what course to pursue. But the priest must have a detailed confession of every mortal sin, and after he has ransacked the conscience of his penitent to the utmost, how does he know that some grievous offence has not been forgotten? But whether forgotten or not, he pronounces absolution upon the penitent. "Yes, but," the Roman Catholic replies, "it is understood by all who go to confession, that the absolution is not valid unless we make a full disclosure of all deadly sins." The very confession which I want. Do you not see then, that your priest may bind on earth what shall not be bound in heaven; and how then can he claim the authority which was given to the apostles? The promise to them was absolute; there was no condition about it; they were qualified for their work. Christ gives them the Holy Ghost, and after endowing them with the spiritual gifts and discernment necessary, he says, "WHATSOEVER,

(without any proviso or exception,) *whatsoever* ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." The priests represent themselves as sitting as Christ's vicars in the court of conscience. Pretty vicars they make truly! Glorious substitutes for the great Searcher of hearts who knew what was in man, and needed not that any should tell him the secrets of the human heart! Christ's *vicars*? But when did Christ ever ransack a conscience according to the mode established and practised by the priests of Rome? In what part of the New Testament are the rites prescribed, which are observed at the sacrament of penance? And here, permit me to present you with Dens' description of these ceremonies.

"The ceremonies which are observed at the sacrament of penance, are as follows: 'First, the confessor in imparting his blessing to the kneeling penitent, says: *The Lord be in thy heart, and in thy lips, that thou mayest worthily confess thy sins: in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Presently the confessor may inquire, how long it is since he has confessed, &c. Having heard the confession, and the necessary questions and examination being finished, the confessor will endeavour to excite the penitent to true sorrow of contrition, above all from the motive of the love of God. Thus the *pastorale*. Lastly, he will enjoin salutary and convenient satisfaction.

"Afterwards let the priest say: *May Almighty God have mercy on thee, and having remitted thy sins, lead thee through to eternal life. Amen.* Then, having raised his right hand towards the penitent, let him say:

May the Almighty and merciful Lord give to thee the indulgence, absolution, and remission of thy sins. Amen. May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee. Thus far the prayers and invocations are preparatory: the absolution from censures follows: *And I, by his authority, loose thee from every bond of excommunication, suspension, and interdict, in so far as I am able, and thou hast need.* If the penitent is a layman, the word *suspension* is omitted. Then follows the sacramental absolution, or the form of the sacrament: *I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.* The confessor subjoins the following prayer. *May the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the Saints, whatever good thou hast done, or whatever evil thou hast suffered, be to thee for the remission of sins, the increase of grace, and the reward of eternal life. Amen.* The rituals permit that, for certain reasons, the said prayers and invocations may be omitted; so that in extreme necessity it may briefly be said: *I absolve thee from censures and sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."*

"*I absolve thee from censures and from sins, &c.*" And yet these *vicars* who are clothed with judicial authority, and who wear the keys of heaven and hell at their girdles, are absolutely dependent on their penitents for information necessary to an intelligent decision, which after all may be erroneous! Their penitents may deceive them as often as they please, and thus make them bind or loose on earth, what may not be bound or loosed in heaven! The apostles never professed to sit

as judges in the court of conscience ! They knew too well that none can forgive sins but God only, and they would have deemed it blasphemous presumption to usurp this prerogative of God ! *Again*; the very fact that *auricular confession*, or confession in the ear of a priest of all sins of every kind and degree is required, constitutes an insuperable objection to this Popish *sacrament*. We argue that it is not a divine institution, because man from his very nature, is disqualified from acting the part, which is assumed by the priests of Rome. God is a God of decency and order, and he never would authorize a sinful man to catechise his fellow creature on subjects concerning which nature and conscience declare that it is a shame even to speak. I need not tell Roman Catholics, whose sense of propriety has not yet been utterly destroyed by the abuse of the confessional, that they are subject to a species of moral torture, which to a sensitive mind, is always excruciating, and the effect of which must be demoralizing. Under the plea of a wish to ascertain the true state of the conscience, inquiries are instituted which may not be named without offering an insult to common decency ; the holy inquisitor sits upon his throne, and tortures his victim at his leisure ; as he is Christ's vicar, he must forsooth be informed of the secret thoughts of his penitent. Even if the subject be a woman, she must disclose all improper thoughts, words and actions, and if she hesitates, she must be assisted by the priest's queries. If she declares her innocence, her conscience is probed again and again, and inquiries are instituted, which have no other practical tendency than to suggest the very

thoughts, language and actions, for which penance is imposed. I have never yet conversed with a convert from Popery, who has failed to give decided testimony in support of that which I here affirm, that the confessional is a sink of corruption, and that its tendency, from first to last, is evil, and only evil, and that continually. The ghostly scrutiny of the confessional suggests and prompts to the commission of more iniquity than it ever can correct. *The priests sit as Christ's vicars in the court of conscience!* If they were to call themselves *Satan's* vicars, it would be nearer the truth. It is part of the devil's business to suggest wicked thoughts, and to corrupt and debase the heart, and this the priests understand to perfection! This language may be deemed severe; but though we do utterly abhor Popery, with all its abominations, we would not say one word against the Pope himself, which we are not prepared most abundantly to substantiate. The evidence in this case is of such a nature that we must be excused from adducing it; but whenever the priests demand it, their own Latin is at their service; and if very earnestly solicited by them, we may give them the benefit of an English version of a part of it; the larger portion, however, can be translated only by the reverend gentlemen themselves. There is a kind of short-hand method of refuting our arguments, and rebutting the charges which we allege against Popery, which has always been a favourite mode in a certain quarter. Whenever any of the dark abominations of the priests' creed are raked out of their *Dens* of iniquity, they assume the air of injured innocence, and tell the public "there are no such

things done as these men say—they are *liars* ! The books from which they quote are not genuine ; and in short, you must not believe a word they say !” Now, Sirs, these gentlemen have as fair an opportunity as they can desire, to expose the frauds of the Protestant ministers, whom they accuse of persecuting Holy Mother. Why do they not come out, and publicly convict us of falsehood ? Why do they shrink from discussion, and blink and wince when we call them out ? “ Ah ! the flesh will quiver when the pincers tear !” They are afraid ; and the reason of their cowardice is the consciousness of guilt ! When a man has truth on his side, it makes him bold as a lion ! He dreads no enemy, and he fears no evil. It is the guilty conscience which makes the sinner tremble at the rustling of a leaf ; “ the wicked fleeth when no man pursueth !” My readers will be able to decide, when they have read a short extract which I will give presently, how much dependence, according to the principles laid down in their own theology, is to be placed upon the OATH of a Roman Catholic priest. The safeguard and great bulwark of the confessional, is the injunction of secrecy which is laid upon the confessor. He is not at liberty, under any circumstances, to divulge any fact which he has learned from a penitent at the tribunal of penance. No matter what the crime is which has been already perpetrated, or which is in contemplation ; though the penitent confesses that he has murdered his father, his wife, or his child, the secret is locked up in the breast of his ghostly counsellor, and under pain of sacrilege and perpetual infamy, it may not be revealed. If the miscreant confesses that he is im-

plicated in a plot to overturn the government or to massacre all the heretics in Philadelphia, the priest to whom he divulges the conspiracy must keep his secret. Peter Dens declares that though the life or salvation of a man, or the ruin of the state should depend upon the information which the priest can give, he must withhold it, if learned at the confessional, and if necessary, he must confirm his denial with an OATH!

Here then we see that according to Romish theology, the priest may be placed in circumstances, in which it becomes his solemn duty to *commit perjury*. And now, we again ask our readers, can any one be at a loss, with these facts before him, to identify the apostate power which is portrayed by Paul, when he represents it as "*speaking lies in hypocrisy*," and describes the Man of Sin as "exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he AS GOD, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God?" In the confessional, the priest claims the authority of God, and asserts that he *is* God. The confessional is in the temple, *not in the priest's parlor*, but in the *temple*; and it is there that he shows himself that he is God. Thus literally is the word of prophecy accomplished respecting the Man of Sin.

My Roman Catholic reader, it is your duty to confess your sins to God, and to forsake them; but it is out of your power to make satisfaction for the least of your offences; all your tears, and prayers, and alms, and fastings, and penances, can not atone for a single sin! Then do you ask, where is the use of repentance? If repentance makes no expiation for our offences, why did

Christ's apostles go out and preach that men should repent? Because God will not pardon a rebel with arms in his hands! Because until you are humbled on account of sin, until you loathe it, and turn away from it as the abominable thing which God hates, until your heart is broken and your spirit contrite, you voluntarily place yourself out of the reach of God's mercy! He does not command you to repent in order that you may thereby make satisfaction to his justice, and cancel the debt which you owe. Your tears cannot pay a debt, which you owe to God—they will not satisfy the claim of your fellow creature. Go to a man to whom you owe one hundred dollars, and see if he will take your tears in payment! Go, and try if he will be willing to give you a receipt in full as an equivalent for a guarantee that you will never become indebted to him for the future! This is the sum and substance of repentance. And will this make satisfaction to the Great God, whose law you have broken? No it will not. Besides the validity of the priest's absolution depends upon his exercise of the proper intention. You are at the mercy of your priest. Though he say "I absolve thee," yet if the proper intention is wanting, his absolution is not valid, and if you die without valid absolution, you are lost. God commands you to repent—he bids you confess your sin and forsake it, because if you are contrite he has provided a Saviour, who has satisfied the claims of divine justice, and for whose sake, God can be just, and the justifier of them who believe in Jesus Christ. The guilt of the transgressor is infinite; but the merits of Jesus are infinite also; and they who put their trust—their whole, undi-

vided and unshaken trust in him, shall never be put to confusion! Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved! Your works of satisfaction are of no value—they are the filthy rags of your own righteousness, which you must put off if you would be clothed in the white raiment—the perfect, glorious, unsullied righteousness of the blessed Saviour! This righteousness becomes yours through faith in Christ! My Roman Catholic brother, your penances are an insult to the God of the New Testament, and whilst you perform them, you exclude yourself from the mercy of God. You challenge his justice; you are still under the law, and your condemnation is inevitable.

POPISH BAPTISM.

GO YE THEREFORE, AND TEACH ALL NATIONS, BAPTIZING THEM
IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE
HOLY GHOST.—Matt. xxviii. 19.

HE THAT BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED, SHALL BE SAVED, BUT HE
THAT BELIEVETH NOT, SHALL BE DAMNED.—Mark, xvi. 16.

The Sacraments which Christ has instituted in his Church are intended to assist the faith of his people. Knowing what is in man, how slow we are to believe and understand the plainest truths of revelation, the Saviour has appointed certain ordinances, which represent by outward and visible signs, the readiness with which God is prepared to dispense his grace towards us. He appoints these outward symbols, not as we believe, by the due performance of the outward ceremony to impart grace, but on account of the weakness of our faith, and we use them, as helps to our faith, and in order to testify on our part in the presence of heaven and of earth, that we are the believing disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ. Augustine, therefore, concisely and correctly defines a sacrament as “a visible sign of a sacred thing.” The Christian Church recognizes two sacraments. The Papal Church enumerates seven. We maintain that baptism and the Lord’s Supper constitute the only sacraments of divine appointment. The Church of Rome teaches that the ordinances of Baptism, Confirmation, the

Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, (or the anointing of the Sick), Holy Orders and Matrimony, are sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ.

Q. "*How many such sacraments do you find in the Scripture?*"

A. "These seven, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme-Unction, (or the anointing of the sick), Holy Orders, and Matrimony." (Grds. of C. D.)

It would appear, therefore, that the Papal Church claims the enjoyment of five sacraments more than the Protestant Church; but we are greatly mistaken if it will not appear before our discussion of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Romish Church is closed, that instead of having five *more* than we have, she has two *less*. The next of the seven sacraments, which claims our attention is baptism. Our plan in this discourse will be first to show what the doctrine of the Romish Church respecting baptism is, and in the next place to point out in what respects Christian baptism agrees, and in what it differs from that which is administered in the Church of Rome. The Grounds of Catholic Doctrines do not contain a proper developement of the papal doctrine of baptism; and I shall therefore quote from the "Larger Catechism of the most Rev. Dr. James Butler, approved by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Kenrick." I am quite sure that the Catechism in question is both genuine and authentic, because it was put into my hands by a young lady, a convert from Popery, who had no farther use for it, and supposed that the book might do more good in my hands, than it would in hers. In addition to the Larger Catechism, I shall refer to Dens' Theology, which has the

sanction of an infallible Archbishop, to the Decree of the Council of Florence, and to the Canons of the Council of Trent. (Larg. Cat. p. 59.) (Decree of the Council of Florence. Dens, p. 369.)

Q. "What is Baptism?"

A. "A Sacrament, which cleanses from original sin; makes us Christians and children of God; and heirs to the kingdom of heaven.

Q. "Does Baptism also remit the actual sins, committed before it?"

A. "Yes; and all the punishment due to them."

Q. "Is Baptism necessary to salvation?"

A. "Yes; without it one *cannot enter into the kingdom of God*. John iii. 5.

Q. "Who are appointed by Christ to give Baptism?"

A. "The pastors of His church; but in case of necessity, any lay man or woman can give it."

Q. "How is Baptism given?"

A. "By pouring water on the head of the person to be baptized; saying at the same time, *I baptize thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Matt. xxviii. 19.

Q. "What did we promise in Baptism?"

A. "To renounce the devil, with all his works and pomps."

Decree of the Council of Florence for the instruction of the Armenians.

"HOLY BAPTISM, which is the gate of spiritual life, occupies the first place of all the sacraments; for by it we are made members of Christ and of the body of the Church. And as through the first man, death has passed

upon all ; unless we are born again, of water and the Holy Spirit, we cannot (as the Truth declares) enter into the kingdom of heaven. The matter of this sacrament is true and natural water: nor is it of importance whether it be cold or hot. But the form is: *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Yet we do not deny but that also by these words, *Let this servant of Christ be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;* or, *such a one is baptized by my hands, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,* a true baptism may be performed: because, as the principal source from which baptism derives its virtue is the Most Holy Trinity, and the instrumental one is the minister, if the act is expressed, which is exercised by the minister himself, with the invocation of the Most Holy Trinity, the sacrament is performed. The minister of this sacrament is the priest, on whom it is ex officio incumbent to baptize. But in case of necessity, not only a priest, or deacon, but also a layman, or woman, indeed even a pagan and a heretic may baptize, provided only he observes the form of the church, and intends to do what the Church does. The effect of this sacrament is the remission of all original and actual guilt ; also of all punishment, which is due for that guilt. On this account no satisfaction is to be enjoined upon baptized persons for past sins ; but if they die before they commit any fault, they immediately arrive at the kingdom of heaven, and the vision of God."

My readers need not be told that on the question of the subjects of baptism, there is a diversity of opinion in the Christian Church. The Reformed Churches of

Germany, the Episcopal Church of England, the Methodist and the Scotch Presbyterian Church, and indeed all evangelical denominations, except our respected Baptist brethren, maintain the doctrine and practice of infant baptism as well as of the baptism of adults. The Church of Rome and the Greek Church do the same. We hold that infant baptism is fully authorized by the Word of God for the following reasons. But first permit me to state the doctrine of the Reformed Church, as presented in the Heidelberg Catechism, (p. 29.)

“Are infants also to be baptized?”

“Yes, for since they, as well as the adult are included in the covenant and Church of God; and since redemption from sin by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, the author of faith, is promised to them no less than to the adult, they must, therefore, by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, be also admitted into the Christian church; and be distinguished from the children of infidels, as was done in the old covenant or testament by circumcision, instead of which, baptism was instituted in the new covenant.”

1. *Infants are included in the Church of God.* The covenant which God makes with the believer extends to his children, also. “I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee,” was the promise of Jehovah to Abraham, and this plainly extends to the new Covenant, for the apostle Peter declares that the promise is unto us and to our children. It certainly would be very strange if the children of believers enjoyed fewer privileges under the Christian dispensation than were secured to them under the Jewish economy. Now, infants were members of

the Jewish Church. If we are told that only male infants were initiated into the Jewish Church, and that therefore, on our own principles, we should baptize only male children, we reply, the Apostle tells us that "in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female,"—and we may retort that at the institution of the Lord's Supper, there were no females present, and yet all Christians agree that they are as fully entitled to the privileges of that ordinance as their fathers, and husbands, or brothers. If again, we are reminded that infants are incapable of reflection, and that it is absurd to introduce an unconscious babe into membership with the Church of God, we would bid our brethren who dissent from us, beware lest haply they be found charging God with folly; for were not infants members of the Church of God under the Old Covenant? And was not their membership a divine appointment? So that *a priori* there is nothing in the doctrine of infant membership, which can be pronounced absurd, without incurring the application of Paul's rebuke—"Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" And why it is more absurd to receive an infant into the Christian Church through the initiatory ceremony of baptism, than it was to receive the male child of the Jew into the Church of God by the rite of circumcision, I cannot conceive. But we may be told again, you cannot show us a single passage in the New Testament, which enjoins the propriety, much less the necessity of infant baptism. May not Jehovah then ask of the Paedobaptist, "Who hath required this at your hands? Bring no more vain oblations." To this I answer, we admit, there is no text of Scripture which in

so many words commands us to dedicate our children to God in this ordinance, though there are not a few which we believe plainly intimate that this was done by the converts under the ministry of the Apostles, as all those passages imply in which it is said that they were baptized, they, and all their house, or family. In not one single instance is any exception made against little children. But the fact that there is no explicit mention of infant baptism, is an argument in favor of the practice, when received in connection with all the circumstances. For certainly, if infants were to enjoy fewer privileges under the New Covenant, than were accorded to them under the Old, there would have been an explicit prohibition to that effect. Now we turn upon those who impugn the practice of infant baptism, and we say to them, 'The burden of proof rests with you. Show us the statute in the New Testament which in so many words forbids us to dedicate our children to God in this ordinance?' And surely if any such prohibition had been intended, it would have been recorded. For what was more natural than for a Jew converted to Christianity, to suppose that his children were included in the blessings of the covenant? How strangely it would have sounded in the ears of the children of Abraham, if the Apostle had said to the house of Israel on the day of Pentecost, when awakened thousands sent up the thrilling appeal to Peter and his associates, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,—*but remember, the promises of the gospel, have nothing to do with your*

children—they are not included in the blessings of the New Covenant, though they used to be in the privileges of the Old!” Would not the Jew have been startled by such an exposition of the New Doctrine? But if there had been any such change intended, would it not have been announced? And if announced, think you that a fact so important would have been omitted in the sacred record? But there is no such announcement made; there is no text of Scripture which forbids the administration of this ordinance to infants, and therefore we should conclude in view of all these circumstances, even had we no farther evidence, that infants are fit subjects of baptism. But we have positive as well as negative proof. For what does Peter say to the inquirers on the day of Pentecost? Their cry was, “Men and Brethren what shall we do?” He replies: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost,” and then he adds:—“for the promise is unto you, *and to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” So far then from excluding the children of believers, he expressly includes them. Instead of telling them that under the New Dispensation, the promise was limited, he gives it all the enlargement which it had under the old. “The promise is unto you and to your children.” But the objector may reply: it is said in Scripture, “He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved,” but infants cannot believe, therefore, they ought not to be baptized. I reply, it is said also “he that believeth not shall be damned,” but infants cannot believe, therefore, they must be damned.

I know our Baptist brethren recoil from such a doctrine, yet they must see that by parity of reasoning, this common objection against infant baptism involves the above inference. I know they believe, when their dear little ones are taken away by the stroke of death, that for Christ's sake, they are received into heaven, for has not Jesus said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven?" Then if infants may enter heaven; if therefore they may be sanctified in infancy, (for they must be sanctified in order to be prepared for the enjoyment of heaven;) if they may possess the substance, if the thing signified by, and in baptism is granted, why withhold from infants the outward and visible sign, when in reality, the sanctifying grace of the Spirit, according to the teaching of our brethren is so freely accorded to them? But then we are told, the Romish Church teaches that infants should be baptized, and therefore Pædo baptism ought to be renounced by genuine Protestants. And the Roman Catholic Church teaches the immortality of the soul, but is that any reason why Protestants should deny that fundamental doctrine of Christianity? In short, my brethren, if we sum up the testimony in favor of the practice of the Reformed Churches in baptizing the children of believers, we present a mass of evidence, which it is much easier to ridicule than to refute. The Covenant which God made with Abraham continues as much in force with Christians as ever it did among the Jews. The children of the Hebrews, being heirs to that covenant, were distinguished from the offspring of the impious, and called "a holy seed,"—and for the same reason

the Apostle affirms, that when only one of the parents is a believer, the children are holy, and therefore differ from the offspring of those who by their impenitence exclude themselves, and, consequently, their infant children also, from the covenant. The Saviour himself, as if to show that he had not come to limit the grace of God, but rather to extend it, did not rebuke the parents, who presented little children to him, (as the words used by the evangelists, in Greek, *Βεσφρα* and *Παιδια* denote not merely little children, but infants at the breast,) he did not send them away with a scornful reproof, but he took the little ones up in his arms and blessed them. Now if it was right in these parents to bring their children to Christ, and he certainly approved the act and admitted them to fellowship with him, why is it wrong for us to offer them to him in baptism, which is the symbol of communion and fellowship with the Saviour? If Jesus himself declares that of such is the kingdom of heaven, why shall they be denied the ordinance which signifies their admission into his kingdom? It is true the disciples rebuked those parents for troubling the Master with their *babes*, but when we remember the gracious encouragement bestowed by the Saviour, we need not be deterred from offering our little children to him, even though some, whom we cheerfully recognize as the disciples of our common Lord, should murmur at us for so doing.

In so far as the recognition of the rights of infants to baptism is concerned, we agree with the Church of Rome, and we are free to assert our deliberate conviction that if no better argument for separation from her com-

munion could be offered than that which is brought against pædo-baptism, the reformation would never have been needed, and would never have taken place.

But here our agreement ends. It is true that we consider baptism by affusion or by sprinkling, and even by immersion as valid, but we differ from the Church of Rome in the mode of administering this Sacrament, in the matter employed in it, and in the effects which we ascribe to it. Neither do we believe that all the subjects which she presents for baptism are proper recipients of this ordinance. As to the mode of baptism, whether sprinkling, or pouring, or immersion be the proper method, that we leave undetermined for the present. We content ourselves then for the present, with saying that we hold, that the application of water, by an authorized minister of the Gospel, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, or to the infant offspring of such believer, constitutes baptism which is valid in the sight of God.

The Church of Rome has corrupted the simple mode of administering this ordinance, as prescribed by Jesus Christ, with a multitude of ceremonies, and provisoes, which would no doubt be very solemn, if they were not unfortunately very ludicrous. Permit me to mention the ceremonies, prescribed by the Church, as specified by Peter Dens, (p. 387.)

"The Ceremonies of baptism must be duly observed in its solemn administration, and are always to be performed, except in a case of necessity. The omission of the ceremonies in an ordinary case is a grievous offence. These ceremonies are divided, for the sake of distinction,

into *general* and *particular*. The latter may be divided into ceremonies *antecedent*, *concomitant*, and *subsequent*.

"The *general* ceremonies are five, to wit, *the solemn benediction of the font*, as it is prescribed in the missal; *the place*; *the time*; *the godfather*, and *the giving of the name*. Concerning this conferring of the name, the 2d provincial Synod of Mechlin resolved, 'that the priests take care as much as possible that the names of Gentiles, or others that are profane, be not given to children.' And our pastorage: 'But the priest will take care that the name of some saint be always given to the person to be baptized, by whose example he may be excited to live piously, and by whose patronage he may be assisted.' Authors observe that the name of some saint of the New Testament is more properly given than of the Old; also rather one than many.

"The *particular* ceremonies preceding baptism, which are performed before the entrance of the baptismal font, among various others, are principally four: viz., *exorcism*, *the sign of the cross*, *the tasting of salt*, and *the anointing of spittle*. The *concomitant*, which are performed after entering the baptistry, are also principally four: viz., *renunciation*, *the anointing of the candidate for baptism with oil of catechumens*, *the catechism*, and *the inquiry of the desire of receiving baptism*. The *subsequent*, which are performed after the sacrament has been finished, are chiefly these three: *the anointing of the baptized person with chrism*, *the donation of a white garment*, and *the delivery of a burning wax candle*. There were formerly certain *special* ceremonies, which concerned the state of the catechumens, &c."

In "the Manual of Ceremonies used in the Catholic Church," we read as follows: (p. 235.)

2. "After the words, *Inficiendo corrumpat*, the Celebrant touches the water with his right hand, which he afterwards wipes as before. At the words, *Per Deum † vivum*, *Per Deum † verum*, *Per Deum † sanctum*, he makes the sign of the cross three times on the water. After the words, *Super te ferebatur*, the Celebrant divides the water with his hand, and throws some of it out towards the four parts of the world, in this form, 1 after the words, *Benignus adspira*, he breathes 3 4 thrice upon the water in the form of the cross. 2 At the words, *Mentibus efficaces*, the first acolyte carries the paschal candle to the Deacon, who gives it to the Celebrant, who sinks it into the water at three different times, but at each subsequent time he sinks it deeper, and sings one tone higher, the words, *Descendat in hanc*. Then blowing thrice upon the water in this form * he goes on. After the words, *Fœcundet effectu*, the paschal candle is taken out from the water, wiped, and given back to the first acolyte, who goes to his place by the cross-bearer. The Celebrant continues what follows in the tone of the Preface as far as the words, *Per dominum*, exclusively, which, with the following words he only recites, the ministers answer, Amen. Then the people are sprinkled with water taken out of the fonts by a Priest in surplice and stole. If the water was blessed in another vessel, the fonts are filled with it; but if it was blessed in the fonts, some of it is taken out to satisfy the devotion of the people, and to bless the houses and other places.

3. "After this, the Celebrant receives from the Dea-

con, the oil of the catechumens, and pours some of it into the baptismal font in form of a cross, saying, *Sanctificetur, &c.* The ministers answer, Amen. Then he pours the chrism into it, in the same manner, saying, *Infusio, &c.*, the ministers answering also, Amen. Lastly, he pours the oil and chrism both together into the water in the form of a cross, saying, *Commixtio, &c.*, and the ministers answer, Amen. Then he mingles the oil with the water, and with his hand spreads it all over the font. This done, two acolytes bring every thing necessary to wash the hands, also the slices of bread and lemon prepared in a plate; the Celebrant assisted by the Deacon, washes and wipes his hands."

Now we admit this thing of *exorcism*, or the art of driving away evil spirits and hobgoblins, and the crossing and criss crossing, are all no doubt very efficacious in the imagination of a devout son of the Holy Church, but having no "thus saith the Lord" for any of them, we do not practice them. As for the tasting of salt, and the anointing of spittle, and the unction of the candidate for baptism with oil of catechumens, and indeed all other elements of Popish baptismal regeneration, we would merely, remark that we suppose when Peter assures us that baptism is *not the putting away of the filth of the flesh*, he never for a moment suspected that the Church which claims him as her Head and her first Pope, would so far pervert or mistake his meaning as to imagine that any part of baptism consisted in *putting filth on the flesh*. We wish it therefore to be understood, by those especially, who regard us as leaning too much towards Rome in our mode of administering baptism, that we have nothing

to do with exorcism, nor with the holy salt, holy spittle, or holy oil, which certain priests exhibit in the administration of what they call baptism. We adhere to the apostolic mode of applying water only, in the name of the Holy Trinity.

We differ from the Church of Rome in relation to the effects of baptism. The definition which is given of baptism by Peter Dens is the following: "a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord, in which, through the external ablution of the body, with the invocation of the Most Holy Trinity, a person is spiritually regenerated." Hence the Roman Catholic regards baptism as regeneration. By the due administration of this ordinance, he is cleansed from all sin, original and actual, and rises up from his knees, pure and holy as an angel. Not a spot, not a wrinkle, not a blemish is to be found on his soul; he is cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit. He does not, like his Protestant brethren, regard the ordinance merely as a sign which intimates to the believer that for Christ's sake his soul is as certainly cleansed in the Redeemer's blood from the pollution of sin, as his body is washed by the application of water, nor yet as the seal of the promise of remission of sins through Christ, but he in fact makes a Saviour of this ordinance. The act of baptism itself confers grace; hence, probably, the origin of the word *christening*; making a Christian, which is not unfrequently, though always improperly, used by Protestants to denote baptism. The 7th Canon of the Council of Trent, respecting the Sacraments, is as follows:

"I. If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the

new law have not all been instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that they are more or less than seven; viz., Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Marriage: or, also, that any one of these seven is not truly a Sacrament, let him be anathema!" (i. e. cursed in this world and damned in the next.)

This peculiar doctrine is sustained by the passages of Scripture in which the Saviour declares, "Except a man be born again, of water, and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Here it is affirmed that the power of regeneration is attributed not less to the water, than to the Holy Ghost. But this is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, and is repugnant to the very first principles of reason. For, in the first place, it is contrary to the *spirit* of the Gospel to make salvation depend absolutely on the performance of any ceremony, inasmuch as *faith* in Christ is the hinge upon which the gate of heaven turns; and then it is a rank absurdity to assert that the application of water to the *body* can cleanse the *soul* from moral pollution. Besides the Apostle Peter asserts the very opposite doctrine, 1 Peter, iii. 20, 21, where speaking of Noah and his family, he says, "God waited in the days of Noe, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here the Apostle affirms that it is not the external act of baptism, which confers salvation; it is not the putting away of the filth

of the flesh, but faith ; the answer of a good conscience which saves us.

We differ again from the Church of Rome, inasmuch as we do not believe that baptism is, in all cases, indispensable to salvation. The Church of Rome teaches that all men, women and children dying without baptism are irretrievably lost. We hold no such doctrine, nor does the Bible teach it. The fifth Canon of the Council of Trent, is to this effect: "Whoever shall say that baptism is optional, that is, not necessary to salvation; let him be accursed." This follows in fact, as a necessary inference from the principle that the act of applying the baptismal water confers the grace of salvation. It impresses what is termed a baptismal character upon the soul, and that character is indelible, and indispensable. Hence we have the monstrous doctrine which is taught and acted out to the very last consequence by the priests, that the soul of an infant, even of an *unborn child*, dying without baptism, must forever be a tenant of the "*limbus infantum*," a kind of infantile hell, in which such children are punished, who have died without the administration of this sacrament. Nor does this strange fanaticism stop here; for the dead body of an unbaptized child must forever be excluded from consecrated ground. Its parents are denied the melancholy privilege of depositing the corpse of their little one in the usual burying place. And to a Roman Catholic, the thought is dreadful that either himself or his children should be excluded when dead, from the ground which the Bishop or priest has blessed! Oh! that our Roman Catholic brethren enjoyed the liberty of the gospel, and understood its spirit! It would then be

an easy matter to convince them, that the blessed Saviour who has said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," never—never could have sanctioned the doctrine, that unless a few drops of water are sprinkled upon the face of an infant ere it breathes its last, its spirit cannot be suffered to enter heaven! The Church of Rome enjoins that *all* infants be baptized; we maintain that from the very nature of the ordinance, the children of believers alone are entitled to its reception, because it is a seal of the covenant which God makes with them, and their seed after them. Hence we regard it as a perversion of the ordinance to administer this rite to any children except, such as are of believing parents. And here, you will permit me also to animadvert on a custom, which was formerly far more prevalent than it is now, but which is still practised to a considerable extent; and which has its origin in the superstition of the Church of Rome. I allude to the practice of sending for a minister in all haste to baptize an infant, when it is in danger of death, precisely as though the Christian parent believed his child must be eternally damned, should it die without the baptismal seal. The conduct of David, when his child was sick unto death, furnishes a case in point. The infant had not yet been circumcised, but David did not anticipate with indecent haste, the eighth day, and when his child was dead, there was no lamentation that its soul was lost in consequence of the want of the sealing ordinance, but the man after God's own heart comforts himself, arises from the dust, lays aside his sackcloth, bows submissively to the stroke of Providence, and says with as much

serenity as if his son had lived to the ninth day, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." It is my deliberate opinion that a child, which is dying is not a fit subject for this ordinance. Certainly baptism was never intended to occupy the place among Christians, which extreme unction holds among papists. The extent to which the fanaticism of the Romish Church urges her priests in the administration of baptism, is too indecent to be fully portrayed even in print, nor would I allude at all to certain features in their doctrine were it not that the representation will be essentially imperfect without them.

The facts which I shall state are not a tenth as bad as some which I might spread before my readers, were it not that modesty forbids me to quote all that Romish theology teaches on this subject. The priest, in the absence of a surgeon, is bound to perform the Cæsarean section, that the child may be baptized before life is extinct, and thus be saved from damnation. He is under solemn obligation to baptize the embryo, in which signs of life appear, and if it is apparently lifeless, he must still baptize it, prefixing this condition, "If thou art alive, I baptize thee," &c. In the case of monsters of doubtful appearance, baptism may be administered on the condition, "If thou art a human being," &c. If the unnatural offspring has two heads and two breasts, it may be regarded as two distinct persons, endowed with two *souls*, but if the danger of death is imminent, it may be baptized with one ablution, altering the form so as to indicate plurality, "I baptize you, &c." If it is doubtful, whether the monster possesses *one* or *two* souls, one part may be

baptized absolutely, and the other under the condition, "If thou art not yet baptized," &c., and if the case is one in which even a Popish priest is at fault, if he is at a loss to determine whether he has a fit subject before him, he may relieve his perplexity by prefixing the condition, "If thou art capable," &c. The tenets of the Romish Church respecting baptism and its subjects have originated a study, in which I have no manner of doubt, the holy priests are very great proficient. This science, upon which elaborate treatises have been written, is known as "Sacred Embryology;" and Cangiamilla is frequently quoted as the standard authority in this strange department of priestly literature. It must be mentioned also, that very great pains is taken to procure the right kind of matter for this sacrament. Peter Dens enumerates the following kinds of water which are sufficient for the matter of baptism.

"Mention some kinds of natural water which are sufficient for the matter of baptism.

"Such are the water of the sea, rain-water, water from a spring, or river, mineral water, whether it is muddy or clear, cold or hot, whether it has been blessed or not.

"The same is maintained with S. Thomas concerning lye and the waters of sulphur baths. So also of waters dissolved from hail, snow, or ice, before the ablution. Henno and Billuart say the same of the moisture of a pavement, or of walls, in damp weather; also of water strained out of clay.

"On the other hand, baptism is invalid, when performed with clay, wine, thick beer, milk, oil, spittle, sweat,

tears, urine; also with ice, snow or hail not dissolved; also most probably with rose water, or any other distilled from trees, herbs, or flowers.

"Yet they maintain plausibly that it is valid with beer, gruel, tea, and similar weak and light decoctions: but it would certainly not be valid, if the solution of the distilled substances is made so strong that the liquor has more of the foreign substance than of the water. It is more doubtful in the case of water dissolved out of salt."

There is another peculiarity which must not be forgotten. In the Christian church, baptism is administered by the regular ministry only, but in the Church of Rome, "in case of necessity, not only a priest or a deacon, but also a layman, or woman, indeed even a pagan and a heretic may baptize, provided only he observes the form of the Church, and intends to do what the church does." I myself heard the late Bishop England affirm in one of his lectures that in a case of necessity, "a Turk, a Jew, or an infidel, would baptize in as valid and effectual a manner as the Pope himself." Of this fact, I have no doubt; for my part, I am disposed to prefer the baptism administered by a Turk to that dispensed by the Pope; for though a profanation of the ordinance, I verily believe, it would not be so great in the former case, as in the latter. In the little catechism on the back of the title page, we read, "The manner of lay persons baptizing an infant in case of danger of death." (See Catechism). To such desperate incongruities does the fanaticism of the Romish church reduce her!

We have seen that the papal church selects some strange subjects as the recipients of her baptism. But

the category of marvels connected with her administration of this rite is not yet exhausted. She baptizes church bells. Of course this ceremony, when duly performed, confers special grace upon the metallic subject, and endows it with wonderful faculties. No ghost can feel easy within the sound of such a blessed bell! Its tones are the terror of evil spirits in the neighbourhood, and the prince of darkness himself keeps out of the way, when the baptized bell peals forth its warning, and bids him begone! By the way, this antipathy might be accounted for on natural principles, if the cracked apparatus which is continually hammered and rattled in our vicinity, be a fair specimen of the blessed bells. But not only are hobgoblins alarmed by these sacred tones; the bell has power to hush the storm; when the tempest is at its height, and threatens to overwhelm every thing that opposes its fury, let the consecrated bell be tolled, and it will act like a charm, the winds will be lulled, and the violence of the storm will abate. And what is more than all, these bells have power to ring souls out of purgatory. So the priests tell us, and if we had never heard of their asserting any thing but the truth, we should certainly owe them some forbearance, even though our belief should, in this case, be withheld. The bell, which is to be baptized, is suspended in the church between crossed poles. When all is ready—the candles on the altar lit up—and every thing just so—the door of the sacristy opens, and forth comes the procession. At the head of it are two boys, dressed in white, carrying two immense candles; next come the priests bedizzened in silk, some dressed in white, some in black, and others

K

flaring out in all the colors of the rainbow. Then there follows a troop of boys arrayed in white, one of whom carries a vase of water, another a vessel of oil. The officiating priest chants a hymn, and reads some Latin over the water. Another reverend gentleman carries the vase of water towards the bells, and the first dips a big brush in the water, and with it makes the sign of a cross, in the name of the Trinity; a third priest, with another brush, makes cross after cross, till the bell is wetted all over, and then the subject is wiped dry with towels. Then follow some more Latin prayers, and the blessing of the oil. Its repeated application inside and out, in the form of a cross, is the next thing, the priest taking care to wipe the anointed parts with cotton or wool. Then the coals are brought in, and a spoonful of incense is thrown upon them, accompanied with some more Latin prayers by the priest, and the bells are filled with the smoke. But the bells must have a name, and in order to this they must have sponsors, and so some old father and mother, not in *Israel*, but in *Babylon*, are chosen as sponsors, and at this stage of the ceremony they step forward, and after divers questions and answers, the bell gets its name, and the priest takes hold of the clapper and gives three strokes against the side; then the old god-father takes hold of it, and does the same, and last of all the god-mother takes her turn. The sponsors then produce their presents, such as linen, and ribands, and silks, which are wrapped like swaddling clothes around the bell, and after a few more compliments between the parties, the farce is ended, and the procession makes its exit. Now, some of my Roman

Catholic readers may be disposed to question these statements, because they have never seen a bell baptized; but in Canada, and in Italy, and in short, throughout countries which are decidedly papal, this ceremony is repeatedly performed, not by night, nor by little children and idiots, but in broad day light, before rational and intelligent men and women. And let the Pope's sworn adherents obtain the modification of our school law, which they seek; let them secure the education of our children; let them succeed in throwing the Word of God, with scorn and contempt out of our public schools, and another generation will not pass, before these and similar absurdities will be enacted in our own city, and in open day, and we shall have permission to say no more about popery, than their reverences think will be for edification. And now in conclusion, I have a word to say to my Roman Catholic readers, which I think will startle them. Sure I am, that it ought to have this effect. It is this: I can prove to you from the acknowledged principles of your church, principles which no intelligent Roman Catholic can honestly deny, that there is not a single one of you that can know with certainty that you have been really baptized. Further, there is not a bishop, or a priest, or a deacon, or a sub-deacon, who knows with infallible certainty that he has been duly, and properly, and really consecrated or ordained! You ask, how so? Need I tell you, it is a doctrine of your church that the priest's *intention* is requisite in order to make a sacrament valid. Thus, if the priest pronounces the words of consecration over the wafer, without intending that it shall be changed into

the body and blood, bones, sinews, and nerves, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, it remains a mere wafer ; but if the consecration is made with the proper intention, the wafer is transubstantiated. So in the administration of baptism, if the priest did not intend to baptize you, the ceremony was not valid. Now, how do you know that this intention was not wanting? How then can you be sure that you are baptized? And on your own principles, you are aware if baptism is not performed in a valid manner, your soul is lost. Both the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent promulge this doctrine of intention, and if you affirm that this proper intention on the part of the priest is not indispensable, you incur their anathema. (Dens, p. 366.) But even supposing that the priest intended to baptize you, when he applied the baptismal elements of spittle, chrism and water, how do you know that he had any authority to perform the functions of his office? Oh! you reply, the *priest* surely has a right to baptize. But how do you know that he is a priest? Are you sure when the bishop dispensed the sacrament of orders to him, that he *intended* to ordain him? Perhaps he did, but *perhaps* he did not. And if the bishop's intention *was* withheld, there is an end of the priest's ordination! But then you tell me, it must be remembered that any one has a right to baptize—midwives, laymen, women and children may perform the ceremony in a valid manner. To this I reply, your church teaches that they may administer the rite in a case of emergency, but if you were baptized under such circumstances, I ask, how do you know that the woman, or child, or whoever administered baptism

to you, did it with the proper *intention*? How do you know that you ever really received a single one of the sacraments, which are dispensed in your church? If the priest's intention is wanting, there is no sacrament for you! Now, before I close, I wish to ask you a simple question, and I put it to you, with a solemn conviction that it may reasonably be propounded to you on the great day. Do you believe, my Roman Catholic brother, that the Eternal Jehovah, who declares in his word that we are born not of the will of man, but of the will of God, and who so loved the souls of sinners, such as you and I, as to send his only begotten son to buy our ransom, and redeem us with his own precious blood; do you believe that the Great God would after all, let your salvation depend upon such a wretched condition as the intention of your priest? If you do, then, inasmuch as your church teaches that baptism is regeneration, and that baptism is not valid unless the priest intends that it *shall* be, you certainly cannot deny that your salvation depends upon the *will* of the priest. But this is contrary to Scripture, which tells you that the regenerate are born not of the will of man, but of the will of God! I bless God, that my hope never can depend upon the whim of a popish priest! Who would look to a fellow creature for salvation? For, "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord." "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is!" The Lord is *our* hope, my Roman Catholic brother, may he be yours!

THE MARKS OF ANTICHRIST.

NOW THE SPIRIT SPEAKETH EXPRESSLY, THAT IN THE LATTER TIMES, SOME SHALL DEPART FROM THE FAITH, GIVING HEED TO SEDUCING SPIRITS, AND DOCTRINES OF DEVILS; SPEAKING LIES IN HYPOCRISY; HAVING THEIR CONSCIENCE SEARED WITH A HOT IRON; FORBIDDING TO MARRY, AND COMMANDING TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS.—2 Tim. iv. 1, 3; See also Dan. vii. 25, and 2 Thess. ii. 4, 9, 10, 11.

Every one of my readers who has made the word of God his study, is aware of the fact, that it contains repeated predictions relative to a great apostate power, which in the latter times, that is, under the gospel dispensation, is to afflict the Church. Its rise and progress were accurately delineated by the prophet Daniel; prior to the advent of the Messiah, and by the Apostle Paul, in his epistles, it has been so accurately painted, and its characteristics have been so plainly defined, that it is a matter of surprise how any intelligent mind should be at a loss, with present developements before it, to ascertain the original from which the apostle drew the portrait, furnished in the above passages. It will be my object to show that these predictions are every one of them fulfilled in the Church of Rome, and that there is no system of religion extant, which bears the marks designated in the word of God as the characteristics of Antichrist, except the Papal power. In looking for the original, of which the inspired writers have given us so

faithful a copy, we are at once circumscribed within certain limits which the Apostle Paul has defined, and beyond which our search need not be extended.

We are told that it shall originate in the Church of Christ; it shall be a departure from the faith; literally an *apostacy*. Hence we at once refute the arguments of those who point us to the Mahommedan delusion, or to any other system of false religion. The Moslem power never constituted a part of the Church of Christ, consequently it cannot be intended by the Spirit, when he speaks of those who shall depart from the faith. Besides the marks of Antichrist are not found in that religion. Gross as its delusions are, they bear no comparison either in magnitude or atrocity, with the mystery of iniquity, which attaches to the Great Apostacy.

The portions of Scripture which I have quoted, present us with a number of characteristics, which I shall examine separately, and in the order in which I announced them.

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith. The phrases, *the latter times* and *the latter days*, &c., are repeatedly used to designate the whole Christian dispensation, and not merely that portion of it immediately preceding the final judgment. Thus Paul, Heb. i. 1, 2, says, "God who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in *these last days* spoken unto us by his Son." During the Christian dispensation, some were *to depart from the faith*. This of course implies that they were once in the faith, constituting a part of the true Church. Now this the Church

of Rome originally was. Among the Thessalonians there were some who supposed that the coming of Christ was just at hand, but Paul warns them not to be deceived, because that day should not come, except there come a falling away first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition. Of the precise period when this apostacy was fully devoloped, it is difficult to speak with certainty. The adage that "Rome was not built in a day" applies with peculiar force to the case before us. The system of wickedness, which now presents itself to our view in the fulness of its strength, was not developed at once. Its beginning was small, but it went on increasing in power, and strengthening with its growth, until it stood forth in the pride of its carnal glory, and uttered great swelling words against the Most High. From the year 260 or 270 to the close of the reign of Constantine, we date the first important developements of this Antichristian power, which was to lord it over God's heritage for a time, times, and the dividing of time; i. e. for three and a half prophetic years, equivalent to the forty-two months, or 1260 days repeatedly spoken of in the Revelation of St. John. For if we multiply the 42 months contained in the three and a half years by 30, which is the number of days assigned by the nations to each month, we obtain 1260 days as the product, the number of days during which St. John declares that the witnesses shall prophesy, clothed in sackcloth. But now what period is meant by these 1260 *days*? If we turn to Ezek. iv. 6, we read the explanation. Here the Lord tells his prophet, "I have laid upon thee the *years* of their iniquity, according to the number of the days—I have appointed

thee each day for a year." Applying this key to the mystery before us, we find that the 1260 days denote so many years; the time, times, and the dividing of time, are equivalent to one year, two years, and half a year, or three years and a half, called prophetic years, every day of which is equivalent to a year, making an aggregate of 1260 years. Now if we add this number to the period before mentioned as the epoch of the first great Antichristian developement, viz: the year 260, we have 1520 as the result, which brings us down to the period of the Reformation, when the first blow was struck at the papacy, which is eventually to prove fatal. In the year 606, the Pope's spiritual power was consummated. Phocas then arrogated to himself the title of Universal Bishop. If we add to this number, the 1260 days during which the witnesses are to be clothed in mourning, we obtain 1866 as the result, and in that year we look for the downfall of the spiritual power of this Great Apostacy. Then the 1260 days will be ended. It was not till the year 756 that the Pope became, in prophetic language, "the Beast;" then he gained the triple crown, and became a temporal as well as a spiritual sovereign. Then that Wicked One was fully revealed, *whose coming is with all power*; for there are but two kinds of power, *civil and ecclesiastical*. If we add to this epoch the 1260 prophetic days, we are brought to the year 2016, when we believe that the mystery of iniquity will be utterly destroyed!

2. "*Giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils*," is to be a characteristic of this apostate power. This "falling away" was to be procured through the

agency of false teachers or seducing spirits, who should teach doctrines of dæmons. The original word is δαιμων, which would have been better rendered *dæmon* than *devil*; διαβολος is the term which properly corresponds to the word used in our version. By dæmons, the heathen designated the souls of departed heroes, statesmen, or philosophers, whom they regarded as a sort of secondary or tutelary gods, under whose special care they believed themselves to be. All Grecian and Roman families of any note had their particular household gods, whom they venerated as their spiritual guardians. Now, this apostate power was to *give heed to doctrines of dæmons*; i. e. it was to worship the souls of departed men, avowedly regarding them as inferior to God. Is this prophecy fulfilled in the Romish Church? It is, to the very letter. Look at a common calendar, it is full of the names of Popish saints, who are invoked by the followers of the Papacy. They tell us, they offer these saints a worship inferior to that which is given to God; they designate the veneration paid to their saints as *δουλια*, and that which they offer to God as *λατρια*; and if we charge them with idolatry, they reply, we do not offer to any creature the worship which we pay to God; we make a distinction between the Creator and the creature. Very well. So did the ancients in Pagan Rome. They professed to pay supreme honor to Jove, whilst they offered a nominally inferior worship to their household gods. Thus literally is the prophecy fulfilled in the Papal church, that they who pertained to this apostacy should give heed to doctrines of dæmons. It is an article of the Papist's Creed; "I constantly hold that the Saints

reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration." And again:

"Q. *What is the Catholic doctrine touching the veneration and invocation of saints?*

A. We are taught, 1. That there is an honour and veneration due to the angels and saints. 2dly, that they offer up prayers to God for us. 3dly, that it is good and profitable to invoke them, that is, to have recourse to their intercession and prayers. 4thly, that their relics are to be had in veneration."

Now the Papist will seek to justify himself by the plea of humility. He is too great a sinner to go directly to Christ, and therefore he has recourse to the saints and angels as his intercessors; but this is the very sin against which Paul cautions the Colossians: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Yet in the light of this Scripture, and of the emphatic declaration that there is *One* God and *One* Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, Roman Catholics persist in worshipping the saints, and thus identify their church as the Apostacy to which Paul alludes when he predicts, that some should give heed to doctrines of dæmons.

3. *Speaking lies in hypocrisy.* In order to induce the

faithful to invoke the saints, the most preposterous tales have been invented, and for centuries the legends of marvels have been increasing, and swelling, until they fill libraries of huge folios which record the "lying wonders" of the papacy. One would suppose that self-respect might have some little authority or weight with the dignitaries of the Romish church in our own day and country, and that in the light of the 19th century, they would scarcely be willing to revive, vamp up and embellish the cast off fables of the "dark ages." But it is not so. They seem determined to furnish abundant evidence which shall identify them with the power depicted by the Holy Spirit, so that the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err in its application. I have already called your attention on a former occasion to a work, entitled the Holy House of Loretto, recently published in this city.

This book professes to be a true history of the miraculous translation through the air, of the house in which the Virgin Mary was born and brought up. The house is described as being about 32 feet long, 13 broad, and 18 high, with a chimney and a small belfry; and is said to have been several times borne aloft through the air and deposited in one place after another, until it was located in the spot where it has remained for the last 600 years, standing without foundation! Whenever a new name is added to the saintly calendar, the claims to saintship must be sustained by some miracle which has been wrought by the saint during his life, or else by his body after death. An officer is attached to the Papal court, who bears the style and title of the Devil's Advocate,

whose special duty it is to investigate the claims of every saint, whose name is proposed for the Calendar. He examines the evidence of the miracles, &c., and if he deems it sufficient, the person is duly canonized by the Pope, and the faithful are taught that their veneration is thenceforth due to the new god, whom the Pontiff has set up. The most common miracle which attests the validity of the saint's claim to special veneration, is that the dead body emits a fragrant perfume. Sometimes, however, in addition to this, some other marvellous incident takes place. At Pazzi in Italy, St. Mary Magdalene was canonized amongst other reasons, because when the virgin body, after death, was exposed in church, a young man of profligate morals, came among others to see, touch, and venerate it. On his approach, the dead body, gravely and in disgust, turned round its head from him, as though moved with "horror of that dunghill!" It is related of St. Anthony, that he sailed on a millstone into Muscovy, and the identical millstone is preserved in St. Peter's at Rome, as a precious relic, together with a vial of St. Joseph's breath, caught by an angel as he was panting, when cleaving wood! This rare relic was long adored in France, piously carried to Venice, and finally deposited in Rome, with awful solemnity. In the same church, is the head of St. Dennis, which he picked up and carried two miles under his arm after it had been cut off. In not a few of the churches, a head of John the Baptist is carefully preserved. If all the heads of that good man, which are kept as relics, really belonged to him, he must have been a descendant of the giant Briareus, whom the Greek poets represent with a hundred heads. Said a dig-

nitary of the Romish Church, on being shown a head of John the Baptist, "How thankful I am! This is the fourth head of John which I have seen in France." The grandeur of the miracle is usually in proportion to the length of time which has elapsed since its performance. In this case, "distance lends enchantment to the view." The Romish Church, however, still claims the power of working miracles, and by narrating lying wonders, such as we have here adduced, by thus *speaking lies in hypocrisy*, she proves that Paul has accurately portrayed her character.

4. *Having their conscience seared with a hot iron.* We should suppose that after the promulgation of frauds and forgeries similar to the above, the guilty fabricators would feel some remorse, but a glance at the morals inculcated by Romish theologians, and the edicts of œcumenical councils will furnish sufficient proof that the conscience of the Babylonish woman is cauterized. The maxim that "no faith is to be kept with heretics," was publicly avowed in the Council of Constance, and John Huss, the Bohemian Reformer, was burned at the stake in accordance with this decree, although he had the emperor Sigismund's safe conduct guaranteed to him by an oath! The council found means to relieve the emperor's conscience, and Sigismund was absolved from his obligation. Pope Martin V. in his letter to the Duke of Lithuania, says, "Be assured that thou sinnest mortally, if thou keepest thy faith with heretics." Gregory IX. issued a decree, absolving all people from all vows and obligations made or incurred to those who had fallen into heresy; and the Bishop Suisanea, professor of law

in the University of Salamanca, in his celebrated work, called "the Catholic Institutions," declares "that by this law of Gregory IX., all governors are released from the bond of their oath." "A Catholic wife is released from her marriage contract with her heretical husband." And he adds: "Justly, therefore, were some heretics (Huss and Jerome) burned by the Council of Constance, although they had been promised security." The Rhemish annotators, in commenting on Rev. xvii. 6, declare "that the blood of heretics is no more the blood of saints than the blood of thieves, man-killers, and other malefactors, for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer." In a late circular, the Pope denounced Bible Societies as "the device of the devil." And notwithstanding the inspired precept which bids us "Search the Scriptures," and the veneration which the Church of Rome professes to feel for the word of God, she forbids the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures, and declares that it does more harm than good. The following sentiments are instilled into the minds of the children and youth, who are under the control of Popish priests.

"Q. Is it lawful for the Laity to read the Holy Scriptures?

"A. They may read them in the language in which they were written, as likewise in the ancient Vulgate Translation, which the Church vouches to be authentic. They may also read them in approved modern versions; but with due submission to the interpretation and authority of the Church.

"Q. Have any great evils ensued from an unrestricted

reading of the Bible, in vulgar languages, by the *unlearned and unstable*?

“A. Yes; numberless heresies and impieties; as also many rebellions and civil wars.” (Butler’s Cat. p. 81.)

By a decree of Pope Paul III., dens of infamous debauchery were publicly licensed, and the revenue accruing from them helped to swell the treasures of the Pope; and at this very day it is a truth notorious at Rome, that a third part of the profits accruing from these haunts of profligacy is paid into the coffers of “HIS HOLINESS.” The letters of Paschal and the secret instructions of the Jesuits show that the most abominable doctrines have been taught by these approved theologians of the Popish Church. Paschal, himself an avowed Papist, introduces Escobar, a Jesuit theologian, as teaching, “that promises are not binding, when the person making them has no intention of keeping them;” that if you say, “I will do so and so, it is understood that you will do it, if you do not change your mind.” Sanchez, another of these Jesuit doctors, says: “You may take AN OATH that you have not done a thing, although you have in fact done it, if you secretly supply in your mind, that you did not do it on a certain day, or before you were born, or by suggesting some similar circumstances, although the words of which you make use admit of no construction which would present your real meaning.” “And this,” he adds, “is very convenient in various emergencies, and is always very proper whenever it is necessary, or to the advantage of your health, honor, or estate.” (Letter 9th.) St. Liguori, who was canonized in 1832, teaches as follows: “When a servant is forced by necessity to agree

to work at low wages, he can compensate himself by stealing from his master the full value of his services."—(Lig. p. 165.)

And again: "It is asked," says Liguori, "whether a servant, by the command of his master, can say, that his master is not at home? It is admitted," says he, "by Card, that he can strike his foot against a stone, and answer, '*he is not here.*'"—Id. ib. 165. "But to this," says the Saint, "I do not agree, if the one who asks the question could by no means notice this. I would rather grant, that the servant could answer, '*he is not here,*' that is, he is not in this door, or at this window—he is not here so as to be seen!!!"—Id. ib.

I repeat that Peter Dens, whose system of theology was reprinted in 1838, and is now in use as well as St. Liguori's, (the latter I have reason to believe is used at the Romish Seminary in Emmittsburg,) affirms that a confessor who is asked concerning the truth which he has learned alone through sacramental confession, must reply that he does not know it, and if necessary, he must confirm the same with an oath. (Dens p. 470.) Can any one be at a loss, with these specimens of Romish theology in view, to discover the apostate power, whose advocates shall be known as speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having *their conscience seared with a hot iron*? Surely that conscience must be dead, and utterly devoid of all moral sensibility, which can remain dormant in the breast of a man who promulgates his approval of such horrid doctrines as these. I might produce worse morals from the same authorities, but these are sufficiently atrocious.

5. But this Antichristian power was to be known by its *forbidding to marry*. Is there any thing in the Church of Rome that answers to this description? Need I remind my readers that it is esteemed a sin of sacrilege against religion for a *priest* to marry? Is it not a fact notorious to all my readers, that the Church of Rome encourages men and women to seclude themselves from the world, and immure themselves in monasteries and nunneries, which thus become the tombs of the living? The institution of marriage is of divine appointment, and the word of God declares it to be holy and honorable in all. The Papal church calls it a *sacrament*, and yet pronounces it a mortal sin, a sin of sacrilege, for a priest to marry. This is a bold and impious innovation upon the prescription of the divine law, which leaves every man at liberty to choose between celibacy and marriage. If a bishop of the Popish church were to perpetrate the crime of matrimony, he would commit an unpardonable offence in our day. The 9th and 10th canons of the Council of Trent respecting marriage are as follows:—

9. "Whosoever shall say that the clergy constituted in sacred order, or regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity may contract marriage, and that the contract is valid, notwithstanding ecclesiastical law, or vow, and that to maintain the opposite is nothing else than to condemn marriage, and that all may contract marriage who do not think that they have the gift of chastity, even though they have vowed it; let him be accursed: as God does not deny this to those who seek it aright, nor does he suffer us to be tempted above what we are able to bear.

10. "Whoever shall say that the married state is to be preferred to a state of virginity, or celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or celibacy, than to be joined in marriage; let him be accursed!"

But in the beginning it was not so. In the days of Paul it was considered right for a bishop to be married. The apostle writing to Timothy, says in his 1 Epis. (and I commend the language of the man of God to the special attention of Romish ecclesiastics, for more than one reason,) "A bishop must be blameless, the husband of *one* wife." And again, "Let the deacons be the husbands of *one* wife, ruling their children, and their own houses well." But we may be told, "though Paul gave this precept, he remained single himself." So he did, but he did not relinquish his liberty to marry if he thought it expedient. He did not remain in celibacy, because it would have been sacrilege for him to take a wife. He may have deemed a single state better for him in the present distress—in the then unsettled state of the church, when husband and wife, and parent and child, were liable to be separated by the sword of persecution; but Paul never surrendered his right; he retained his liberty to marry if he choose.

Here are his own words: (1 Cor. ix. 3—5). "Mine answer to them that do examine me is this; have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not *power* to lead about a sister, a *wife*, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" It seems actually as though the Romish church had been at pains to identify herself as the Apostate power foretold by the

sure word of Scripture prophecy. She has established brotherhoods and sisterhoods innumerable. She makes celibacy a virtue, and I am sorry to say, a greater virtue than *chastity*. I have before me two volumes printed and published with the sanction of the Emperor of Austria, which contain the history of the rise and progress of some 500 different orders of monks and nuns, who make their living chiefly by begging, either directly or indirectly. What country can afford to support such crowds of lazy mendicants? Paul tells us, "if any will not work, neither shall he eat;" if the apostle's rule were applied in the case of three-fourths of these monks, the holy confraternities would soon be starved to death! It is a very common thing for Romish priests to speak sneeringly of the different sects into which the Protestant church is divided, but let them look a little nearer home and they will find matter sufficient for the exercise of their powers of sarcasm. Among the different denominations of those, who are forbidden by the church to marry, are the following:

In Biedenfeld's history of the different orders of monks and nuns, we read of the "Society of grey penitents," founded A. D. 1578; of the "Reformed grey sisters, at Mons," founded, 1689; of "White penitents, at Avignon," and another brotherhood of penitents of the same colour, at Lyons. Then, there are "Priests of the Holy nail, at Siena," founded in 1567; "Blue penitents at Rome," (1571;); Black penitents at Rome, (1577.) "Tailor-brethren," (1647;); "Shoemaker-brethren of poor Henry," (1645.) "Daughters of the childhood of Christ," (1657.) "Brethren of stillness and solitude,"

(1664;) Sisters of stillness and solitude ;" "Sisters of the child Jesus," (1678;) "Brethren of the child Jesus," (1681.) "Daughters of the good shepherd," (1686.) "Nuns for the continual adoration of the Holy Sacrament," (1653.) "Congregation of the consecrated of the Most Holy Mother of God," (1832,) &c., &c., &c. These are selected out of about 500 different religious orders ; and are presented as specimens of the sects of the Romish Church ; there is probably much more difference between these blue and grey, and black and white penitents, than there is between any of the leading evangelical denominations of the Protestant Church. And certainly amid all the dissensions, which have disgraced Protestant Christendom, there never have been feuds so deadly as those, which have obtained between some of the rival orders of monks in the Romish Church.

I need not spend much time in laboring to convince an intelligent reader that the celibacy of the Romish ecclesiastics and of the different orders of monks and nuns has originated more licentiousness than any other cause which can be named. History is full of details which my readers must study at their leisure, as they are not fit to be named under present circumstances. One thing, however, I may just remark in dismissing this point, viz. that it is worthy of note that the number of monasteries and nunneries is about equal, and that *orphan asylums* are probably in the proportion of one, for every pair of these parent institutions.

6. *Commanding to abstain from meats*, is another peculiarity which is to mark the Church of Antichrist. Does the Church of Rome enforce any such command?

Indeed she does. Who does not know that it is a mortal sin to eat meat on Friday, or during Lent, except by special indulgence obtained from the Bishop? Every Roman Catholic knows that it is one of the six precepts or principal commandments of the church. The second precept of the church is, "*To fast and abstain on the days commanded.*" This precept is then explained as follows in the "*Larger Catechism*," with which my Roman Catholic friends are familiar:

"Q. What do you mean by fast days?

"A. Certain days on which we are allowed but one meal, and forbidden flesh meat.

"Q. What do you mean by days of abstinence?

"A. Certain days on which we are forbidden to eat flesh meat; but are allowed the usual number of meals."

Here then, this mark of Antichrist is literally branded on the church of Rome. The fasting which she enjoins consists not in entire abstinence from all food for a stipulated time, but in abstinence from MEATS, under pain of mortal sin.

Now I shall not be understood as intimating that a person does wrong in abstaining from meat, if he thinks proper to do so—neither do I wish to imply that it may not be profitable at some times, or if you will, at *stated* times, to *fast*; on the contrary, I believe that it is *our* privilege to humble ourselves, and to seek the Lord by fasting and prayer, as much as it was the privilege of the apostles and primitive Christians; neither does the apostle assert that no benefit can accrue from *fasting*, judiciously practised—nor yet does he affirm that *fasting* shall be a peculiar feature of the apostacy which he is

describing, but he designates it as *COMMANDING to abstain from meats*. The word of God leaves it optional with the Christian to choose his own time for fasting; it points out no particular seasons, which must by divine authority be observed as days of abstinence, and it was to be a characteristic of the Apostacy that it should take away this Christian liberty, and *COMMAND* abstinence, under positive and fearful penalties. This the Church of Rome does, and it is remarkable how exactly and to the very letter she furnishes the counterpart of Paul's description. Here in the Larger Catechism, I read that the second precept of the church is, "To fast and abstain on the days *COMMANDED*."

The second feature which corresponds in the practice of the Romish church, to the portrait which the apostle has drawn, just as face answers to face in water, is the distinction which is made in the different kinds of food, from which abstinence is commanded. "*COMMANDING to abstain from MEATS*"—not from every kind of food, but from *MEATS*—thus designating one particular creature of God, which, although universally known as a proper article of diet, was to be avoided, as pernicious by the command of Antichrist. This Paul rebukes; "for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." Now, is it not as plain as though Rome had stood before the mirror, which Paul holds up to the view of the Church, that the practice of the Papal church corresponds precisely to that which he has here depicted? No matter how much food is taken on a day of *abstinence*, no sin is committed, pro-

vided the command to *abstain from MEATS* is observed. This the Catechism teaches. "What do you mean by days of abstinence? Certain days on which we are forbidden to eat *flesh meat*; but are allowed the usual number of meals." And even on a *fast day*, which differs from a *day of abstinence* in restricting the faithful to *one* meal, there is no real *fasting*—for that *one* meal makes up for the two, which are omitted, if the gauge which Peter Dens allows, is that which the priests enjoin. He tells us that on a fast day, the full refreshment, as it is called, must not be protracted *beyond two hours!!* "THEN THE GUESTS ARE TO BE ADMONISHED THAT THEY ABSTAIN FROM EATING." Observe again; the apostle tells us, Antichrist shall command to abstain from MEATS—not simply from MEAT, but from MEATS, i. e. from every article which may be considered as partaking of the *nature* of animal food. This too is literally fulfilled. Peter Dens tells us, p. 324, "Under meats are included the broth of meats, and those things which derive their origin from flesh, as eggs", &c. Here then, we have examined the passage in 1 Tim., and we find that the Church of Rome fully answers to Paul's description. I shall proceed to the consideration of the prediction from Daniel, relative to the same apostate power, as I think I have shown with sufficient clearness and precision, that from the 1 Epistle to Timothy, we may recognize in the Church of Rome the Antichristian Power which Paul describes.

Daniel portrays it as *speaking great words against the Most High*. And this, the Man of Sin has always done. He has usurped the name and the prerogatives of God.

The Pope is repeatedly spoken of as "OUR LORD GOD, THE POPE." He puts himself between Jehovah's *word*, and the people, and pronounces the Bible a prohibited book. In the face of the God of heaven—and against the very letter of God's commands, he forbids us to SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES! He exalts his canons and traditions and bulls, to equal authority with the Bible! He makes them even superior to God's living oracles! "He opens his mouth in blasphemies against the Most High," as often as he styles the Virgin Mary, the MOTHER OF GOD! A power and majesty are ascribed to her, utterly inconsistent with her condition as a creature. She is accosted in terms of the most revolting idolatry; in the prayers which are offered to her, in a work published in Dublin, by John Coyne, A. D. 1833, entitled the *Glories of Mary, the Mother of God*, she is addressed in this language, "All power is given to you, O Mary, in heaven, and on earth." And again, "All are subject to Mary's empire, even GOD HIMSELF." Look at the Pope's Encyclical Letter of 1832, which Gregory XVI, the present Pope, closes in these words, "Now, that all these events may come to pass happily, and successfully, let us lift up our eyes, and our hands to the *most holy Virgin Mary*, who alone has destroyed all heresies, and is our *greatest confidence, even the whole foundation of our hope!!*" Can any unprejudiced mind be at a loss to discern the Antichristian power, which Daniel describes as speaking great words against the Most High? But he tells us farther, *he shall wear out the Saints of the Most High*. Ah! the blood of sixty-eight millions of the human race, which has flowed from the veins of the

saints and martyrs of Jesus, and which cries to God for vengeance against the Babylonish harlot, leaves us no room to hesitate respecting the application of Daniel's prediction! The Church of Rome has literally *worn out* the saints of the Most High! Witness the heartless cruelties practised upon the simple and pious Waldenses! See the torrents of blood, which have been poured out like streams of water among the martyred Culdees, and Albigenses, and Bohemian brethren! Look into the horrid dens of the Inquisition, before whose ghostly tribunal the young man, and the blooming maiden, the aged father and the fond mother were dragged under the pretext of the suspicion of heresy, but in reality to glut the avarice or lust, or malice of the diabolical inquisitors! The saints of the Most High were *worn out* by the tortures of the rack, and the fire. Satan ruled supreme in this infernal office! Its interior was in strict accordance with the deeds of darkness and of blood, which were daily enacted within its gloomy walls! It seemed as though the seat of Satan had been removed to the earth, and as if he had established a hell in miniature among men! There, by the flash of the gleaming torch, you see the servants of the Holy Inquisition; their countenances stern with cruelty, frowning with the scowl of malice upon the victims of ghostly tyranny. In vain does the affrighted prisoner shriek with terror, and call for help, when he views the instruments of death! The torturing dungeons are so deep; the massy doors are so close, that no groan however loud, no wail of men in their death agony, no shriek, however piercing, can reach the upper air! There in hopeless, helpless misery, the

unhappy victims of Antichrist submit to the horrid cruelties with which he wears out the saints of the Most High! One mode of torture, I will mention. "When the Spanish Inquisition was thrown open by the troops of Napoleon and King Joseph, an image of the Virgin was found standing in a dark corner of a cell. On closer inspection it was discovered by the French officer to be an engine of torture; underneath the robes with which the image was covered, was a metal breastplate stuck full of needles, spikes and lancets. The familiar was ordered to manœuvre it. He did so; it raised its arms as if to embrace; a knapsack was thrown into them; gradually the arms closed, pressing the object within them closer and closer to the breast of the image, crushing and piercing it with a hundred wounds!" This is one of the implements of death with which papal Rome in the nineteenth century stood prepared to wear out the saints of the Most High! Oh! who can number the tears, and count the sighs that have been wrung from the weeping, tortured prisoners of that accursed office! The record has been kept in heaven. It is there now. So sure as God is on his throne, the doom of the oppressors of Jehovah's people is sealed! God will avenge his martyred, broken-hearted children! But says the Prophet, farther, *he shall think to change times and laws*. Has not the Church of Rome changed *times*? Look at her numberless holidays, and festivals of the saints. She has crowded so many of them into the year, that scarcely the half of the week is left on an average to the people as working days in a papal country! She has arrogated to herself the right of making times holy or unholy at

her option ! And what are many of her festival days but carnivals of licentiousness and intemperance ? *But he shall think to change laws also as well as times !* Antichrist shall change the laws of God. What is there in the Church of Rome that corresponds to this ? Much—much every way. Take up the Catechisms and books of devotion which she publishes in our own city, and you will find evidence enough. Here is a book bearing the approval of Bishop Kenrick on its title page, called the Christian's Guide to Heaven. On page eighty-six of this book, I find an examination of the ten commandments, in which the second commandment is left out. Not a word is said about bowing down to graven images. This commandment has been practically as well as theoretically stricken from the tables of stone ! *He shall change laws !* God's word declares that there is one God, and *one* Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus." Christ Jesus promulges solemnly, "No man cometh to the Father, but by me," and yet the Church of Rome teaches that it is good and right to invoke the saints as mediators between God and man ! *He shall change laws !* The word of God declares that by *one* offering for sin, Christ has perfected forever them that are sanctified ; the Church of Rome tells us that Christ is daily offered in the mass, as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead ! *He shall change laws !* Rome has done so in forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats ! *He shall change laws !* Rome has done so, by appointing penances, and works of satisfaction, and selling, indulgences whilst the law and testimony of God declare it is by faith alone, *that living*

faith which produces works of holiness, that we are justified.

Finally, Paul declares that he shall be known, by *his opposing and exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped*. This the papal authority has done! It has dethroned the kings and emperors of the earth! Civil rulers are sometimes called gods in Scripture, thus, "I have said ye are gods, but ye shall die like men." But no secular power has been owned as Rome's superior in the days of her proud supremacy. See Henry, the Emperor of Germany, standing for three days in the open air, at the gates of the fortress of Canusium in which Pope Gregory resided, in the midst of the rigors of a severe winter, barefoot, and with his head uncovered, and no other raiment, but a wretched covering of woollen cloth. It was not till the fourth day that the Pope would admit him to an audience!

But he is to sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Just as every Romish priest does in the confessional, which is in the temple, and where Peter Dens tells us the priest knows nothing as a man, though he does know it as God. So that the priest is at liberty, nay under obligation if necessity requires, to declare with an oath that he knows nothing about a subject which he has learned in the confessional!!

His coming is to be with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish. This appeals in tones of thunder to my Roman Catholic readers. You, my brethren, are they who are led captive by his unrighteous deceptions. The pertinacity with which the victims of papal delusions adhere to their errors, gross and appal-

ling as they are, is proverbial. Thus are they, the living monuments of the truth of this prediction—his coming shall be with *all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish!* Such is the power of error, when backed by the corrupt inclinations of the carnal heart, and the deceitful wiles of Satan, that nothing but the omnipotence of sovereign grace can overcome it. The victim of superstition may be convinced that both reason and Scripture are against him, yet he clings to his false religion with the grasp of death! I know it is hard for the unregenerate man to confess that he has been in error, and harder still to renounce it; I know that pride of opinion is a formidable barrier; it is humiliating to flesh and blood to be convicted of having long cherished and maintained erroneous views, when those views have been strengthened by the power of education and habit. Hence it is possible to become so wedded to error, as at last in all sincerity to conceive that we are *right*, and thus to believe a lie. The voice of reason, conscience, Scripture and the Spirit of God may all be hushed, and that may come upon you, which is spoken of by the apostle, when he speaks of the advocates of Antichristian error. "For this cause, God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness!" Let it be remembered that this is affirmed of those, who are led away by the Man of Sin, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders! May God bless his own testimony, and save us all from the "deceivableness of unrighteousness" of the wicked one, and from

the damnation of those, who are given up to the delusions of Antichrist, because they believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness!

If these pages are perused by an infidel, who has doubted the authority of the Bible, or questioned its authenticity as a revelation from God, I would remind him that the evidence of the fulfilment of prophecy is an undeniable proof of its divine inspiration. The same God, who has recorded this delineation of Antichrist—so minute in its details, and so amply developed before our eyes in the Romish apostacy, has also declared that he will punish the unbeliever and the transgressor. And so sure as God is true, he will keep his word. “He that believeth not shall be damned.” Mark xvi. 16.

THE MARKS OF ANTICHRIST.

AND HE CAUSED ALL, BOTH SMALL AND GREAT, RICH AND POOR, FREE AND BOND TO RECEIVE A MARK IN THEIR RIGHT HAND, OR IN THEIR FOREHEADS: AND THAT NO MAN MIGHT BUY OR SELL SAVE HE THAT HAD THE MARK, OR THE NAME OF THE BEAST, OR THE NUMBER OF HIS NAME. HERE IS WISDOM, LET HIM THAT HATH UNDERSTANDING, COUNT THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST: FOR IT IS THE NUMBER OF A MAN; AND HIS NUMBER IS SIX HUNDRED THRESCORE AND SIX. Rev. xiii. 16—18; See also Rev. xiii. 3—6.

The passages before us contain a few of the many characteristic marks, which the apostle John designates as peculiar to Antichrist, and which are all found in the apostate papal power. As already stated, the rise of this apostacy was predicted by the prophet Daniel, and by the apostle Paul in his Epistles to the Thessalonians and to Timothy.

We think that we have already offered evidence sufficient to convince any unprejudiced and intelligent reader that the predictions of the apostle Paul, and those prophecies of Daniel to which we have referred, are all to the very letter fulfilled in the history, the doctrines, and the practice of the Roman Catholic Church. The apostacy was to originate in the Church of Christ. We showed that the Church of Rome had departed from the faith. It was to give heed to doctrines of *dæmons*, i. e. it was to worship the souls of departed men and women,

who by an apotheosis among the Greeks and Romans, were made objects of worship, avowedly inferior to that which was offered to the supreme Deity. This we showed to be precisely in accordance with the Popish invocation of saints. The followers of this apostacy were to be known *as speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron.* We showed you that Popery is from first to last, a system of falsehood and fraud, and that the maxims of approved theologians and canonized saints recommend the "speaking of lies," and exhibit an utter destitution of moral sensibility in the conscience. Antichrist is to be known by his forbidding to marry, and the Church of Rome again identifies herself as the apostacy in question, by the celibacy of her priests and nuns. He was "to command to abstain from meats;" we showed you that the Romish Church does this very thing, and that her Catechisms furnish a literal confirmation of our assertion, that she is the Great Apostacy. We reviewed the prediction of Daniel relative to the great words which Antichrist should speak against the Most High, and pointed out a few of the atrocious blasphemies, which abound in Popish books of devotion. As proof that Rome had richly earned the mark of blood, by which Antichrist should be known, we referred to the horrid cruelties of the Inquisition, in which the Saints of the Most High have been *worn* out. His changing of times and laws receives abundant illustration in the appointment of festival days of the saints, by which the Church of Rome has, at her option, made times holy or common. The changing of laws is evidenced by her making that a duty, which the Bible

declares to be idolatry. The second commandment in the decalogue forbids the making of any graven thing as an object of worship, positively denying the propriety of bowing down to any image or picture, "to the likeness of anything in heaven above or in the earth beneath;" the Church of Rome commands the faithful to do this very thing which God forbids, and blots out the second commandment from the record, by omitting it in her Catechisms. And here, lest I should appear to the better instructed Papist not to give him the full advantage of the explanation which is offered in his books, I will quote the apology, presented in Dr. Doyle's Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, for the omission of the second commandment. (See page 42.)

"Q. Why are not these words expressed at length in many of our short catechisms? A. Because they are sufficiently included in the preceding words, Thou shalt not have strange (or other) gods before me.

"Q. How declare you that?

"A. Because if we must have no other but the only true God, who created heaven and earth, then it is clear to the reason of every child, that we must not have many gods, or any graven things for gods, or adore any other things for God."

Have you read this apology? Is there a Christian that does not shudder at its blasphemous impiety? What is its import? Does it not plainly imply that Jehovah has darkened counsel by words without knowledge? That the second commandment is a vain repetition of the first? It is so plain, forsooth, that "it is clear to the reason of every child that we must not have any

graven things for Gods," therefore there is no use in the explicit prohibition of all bowing down to graven images! And yet, with blasphemous effrontery, the Church of Rome pours her curse upon the head of the man who protests against her image worship!

We showed that the papal power in exact conformity with the inspired delineation of Antichrist, opposes and exalts itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped! We proved that the priest claims to sit as Christ's vicar in the court of conscience, and "that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;" the confessional is in the temple, and there, the priest is taught that all that he learns, he knows as God and not as man, so that he not only may but must take an oath if necessary, that he is ignorant of all that has transpired at the tribunal of penance. The "lying wonders" of Antichrist we showed to be fulfilled in the silly and blasphemous legends of the Popish saints, and proved that the deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, receives fearful illustration in the determined obstinacy with which the Papist rejects the light of truth. Said a Roman Catholic in the country, a short time ago; (I have the statement from the lips of the clergyman to whom it was addressed,) said a Roman Catholic to him, after the clergyman had endeavored to convince the poor man that he was in error, "If Jesus Christ himself were to come down from heaven and to tell me that the Church of Rome is not the true church, I would not believe him!" I myself was once told by a deluded Papist whom I strove to lead to the truth, after warning him that Popery would in-

evitably destroy his soul, if he did not renounce it, "If I had a thousand souls, I would lose them all, rather than renounce my church!"

If this is the spirit, which glows in the breast of any of my readers, I am well aware there is more hope of a fool than of such men. I know that they who are given up to strong delusion to believe a lie can reject any amount of evidence, and *they will* cling to their apostate religion, until they are damned! For the Scripture declares it, "For this cause, God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." But I know that they who are deceived by this unrighteous system do not *all* belong to this class of hopeless bigots, and because we are sure that truth is mightier than error; because we know that the Spirit of the living God can make the haughtiest scorner wise, and in spite of him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, dissipate the darkness of superstition by the light of the gospel; and because we are commanded to put the brethren in remembrance of these things," therefore, whether the victims of delusion will hear, or forbear, we shall bring the testimony of the Lord before them, and leave the result with him, who holds the hearts of men in his hand, and who can turn them withersoever he will as the rivers of water!

In addition to the marks of Antichrist already mentioned, and which I have briefly reviewed, the apostle John in the passages recited before you, specifies the following: "*He caused all both small and great, rich and*

poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads."

Here, as before, the inspired writer descends into particulars, and furnishes such details that it is impossible there should be any room for doubt, provided the SAME apostate power so clearly designated, should in addition to characteristics already named, present the marks which are here portrayed. Is there any ceremony in the Roman Catholic Church, which answers to this picture? Does the Church of Rome "cause all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their forehead?" Let us examine the ceremonies performed at the ordination of every Romish priest, and we shall find the counterpart of John's description. The candidate for priestly ordination, attired in the costume of a Popish deacon, approaches the altar, and ascending to the upper step, kneels down before the Bishop, who sits with his back to the altar, and his face towards the people, who may be assembled as spectators of the ceremony. Whilst on his knees, his hands are tied together, in token of submission to the Bishop, within whose hands he places his own, and vows obedience, solemnly binding himself at the same time to a life of continency and celibacy. Having thus surrendered himself to the bishop, his hands are released, and the Bishop marks him in the right hand with what is called Holy Oil. This mark is made in the form of a cross. Being thus ordained and marked, he is arrayed in the gorgeous sacerdotal robes. The "golden cup," or chalice is then put into his hand, together with the plate which contains the bread, indicat-

ing that the priest has power to change a wafer into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. John tells us that the woman whom he saw in his vision had "*a golden cup in her hand.*" The dress of Popish ecclesiastics resembles the costume of a "woman," and hence probably, the reason of the figure employed by the Holy Spirit to represent the apostacy, "the mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth." Thus then we have shown the meaning of the *mark in the right hand*. Is there any Roman Catholic here, who does not know what is designated by the "*mark in the forehead?*" Is it not a fact known to every follower of this apostacy, that a mark on the forehead is received by all the subjects of the Romish church once every year? Many of my Protestant readers have seen the faithful on Ash Wednesday, which is the first day of Lent, coming out of the Popish chapels with a sign of the cross made with ashes upon their foreheads. This mark is received by ALL, without distinction; thus literally is the prophecy fulfilled that this apostate power should "cause all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads." The design of imprinting this mark, as the Romish ritual tells us, is to remind those who receive it that they are mortal. On page 23 of the "*Manual of the ceremonies used in the Catholic Church,*" we read as follows. See page 23.

SEC. II. *Of the putting on the Ashes.*

"1. The Celebrant, if there be no other Priest, having made a reverence to the cross, kneels down in the middle of the platform of the altar, and whilst thus kneeling, puts ashes on his own head, without saying any thing.

"2. But if there be another Priest, this Priest without stole goes to the altar, and puts ashes on the head of the Celebrant, who is standing, inclined, and having his face turned towards the people, the Priest saying, *Memento homo, quia pulvis es; et in pulverem reverteris.*

"3. The Celebrant having received the ashes, goes to the Missal on the Epistle-side, and recites, with the acolytes, the anthem, *Immutemur*, with all that follows.

"4. Then the Celebrant puts the ashes on the clergy, (if there be any) who will kneel at the edge of the platform of the altar, the first of them in dignity being the nearest to the Epistle-side, saying to every one, *Memento*, &c.

"5. The Celebrant having bowed to the altar, goes between the second and third acolytes to the railing at the Epistle-side, and puts the ashes first on the men, then on the women."

The marking in the right hand is significant of power.

But before I proceed to the next characteristic presented in the Scripture passages under review, I would remind my Roman Catholic readers of the awful curse pronounced, *not* by a Popish Council, but by Almighty God, against those who receive the mark of the Beast. "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone for ever and ever." Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11. "Oh! that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end!" Oh! that they would listen to the voice which calls in the gospel, "Come out of her my people, and

be not partakers of her sins, lest ye receive also of her plagues." That *mark*, my Roman Catholic reader, if found upon you in the day of the Lord, will brand you as a son of perdition.

2. But it is said farther, "*No man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.*" If we turn to the decrees of Popes and of Popish councils, we find such sentiments as the following: "No man ought even to speak to those with whom the Pope is at enmity." Gratian avers "that sovereign obedience is due to the Pope, and that it is not lawful for any man to commune with one who is an enemy to the Pope, neither can he be in the church who forsakes his authority." The Church of Rome is the only Church in the world, which forbids her subjects to trade with those who are excommunicated. She literally prohibits them "to buy or sell," or to hold any communication with those upon whom she has laid her interdict. This article in the discipline of the Church of Rome was explicitly enacted in the General Council of Constance, under Martin V, A. D. 1414. A case occurred about eleven years ago in Detroit, in Michigan, in which a Popish priest, known as Father Richard, undertook to enforce this discipline. I will give the circumstances as related by Samuel B. Smith, of New York, who was formerly a Popish priest. A Roman Catholic gentleman wished to marry his niece, but the priest very properly objected to the match as contrary to the rules of the Church. Five hundred dollars, however, procured the requisite dispensation, and his niece became his wife. Shortly afterwards something occurred which

brought down the priest's displeasure upon the man, and in short, he was excommunicated. Father Richard, then promulgated from the pulpit, the decree relative to persons excommunicated, by which every member of the Romish Church was formally forbidden to deal with him; they could neither buy from him nor sell to him, without incurring the anathema of the Church. The consequence was that the excommunicated person, who was a merchant, became bankrupt. Upon this, he sued the priest for damages accruing from the prohibition "to buy or sell," and the court awarded his claim; an appeal was then taken by his Reverence to a higher tribunal; and the final result of the trial we do not know. Here then, we find that this characteristic of the Great Apostasy is accurately verified in the discipline of the Church of Rome. "No man might buy nor sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." When the act of excommunication is performed "the mark" is effaced; and the offender is to be shunned by all the faithful.

But what is meant by the following words: "*Here is wisdom, let him that hath understanding, count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred, three-score and six.*" The apostle here invites inquiry to discover and "count the number of the Beast," and in order to furnish us with a key by which to open the mystery, he tells us it is the "number of a man," i. e. it is the name of a man numerically calculated. It was a common thing for the ancients in the time of St. John to represent names or titles by the number which the letters of that name

would make when added together. We still partially adopt this practice, as any one may see by just looking at the dial of his watch, upon which numbers are designated by Roman Letters. Thus V stands for five, X for ten, I for one, &c. The apostle tells us therefore, in order to guide us in our inquiries relative to the name of the Beast, that the letters of his name, numerically reckoned, or the "number of his name" will make exactly "six hundred, three-score and six." In addition to this, the name which shall be composed of letters making this aggregate, must designate a power which shall possess all the other attributes mentioned as belonging to "the Beast." The Revelation of St. John was written in Greek, and consequently the word, whose number shall be six hundred three score and six, must be sought in that language. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John, the inspired writer of the Revelation, was the first who counted the number of the Beast, suggesting the name *λατεινος*, the letters of which word, added together, make the sum of six hundred and sixty-six. The meaning of *λατεινος* is the "Latin man or church."

We give the opinion of Irenæus in his own words, because his testimony has great weight with Roman Catholics. He says, speaking of the name of *LATEINOS*: "It contains the number of six hundred and sixty-six, and it is very likely because the last kingdom is so called, for they are Latins who now reign: but in this we will not glory." Now the application of the name *LATIN* to the Church of Rome is certainly appropriate. In the first place, the Romans were anciently called Latins, and

to this day the Church of Rome is called the *Latin* or Western Church, to distinguish it from the *Greek* or Eastern Churches. Besides, Papists *Latinize* every thing. Their mass is Latin, their prayers are Latin, their litanies are Latin, the canons of their councils are Latin, their decretals are Latin, their bulls are Latin, Papal councils speak Latin; they have a universal authorized version of the Scriptures in no other language but Latin. The Council of Trent decreed that the Latin Vulgate should be considered the only authentic version of the Scriptures, and to this day, Popish priests pay comparatively little attention to the Hebrew or Greek text, though containing the very words in which the inspired penman wrote the Scriptures.

But we are to show that the letters of the word *λατρευος* numerically counted, according to the value ascribed to them by the Greeks, make the aggregate of six hundred and sixty-six. Six hundred, three-score and six. Write them out, and you have the following :

Λ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
Α	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Τ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	300
Ε	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Ι	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Ν	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50
Ο	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70
Σ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200

666

Now let us examine the number of the Beast's name, taking the Hebrew word רומית (Romith,) which signi-

fies "Roman Kingdom," as the name in question, and we have the following:

7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
400	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400

666

Here then, we have the name of the Beast, and the number of his name in Greek and Hebrew, and they both amount to the precise number, designated in God's word. We can find a Latin title too. One of the names which the Pope arrogates to himself is the *Vicar of the Son of God*, "Vicarius Filii Dei." Analyze this title, and those letters which were employed by the ancients to signify different numbers will, when added together, make the sum total of six hundred and sixty-six. Thus: V.=5; i=1; c=100; a—; r—; i=1; u or v (one letter in Latin) 5; s—; F—; i=1; l=50; i=1; i=1; D=500; e—; i=1; 666. Now we challenge the world to find another name in these three languages, Greek, Hebrew and Latin, which shall designate the same number. And when that is discovered, where can another apostacy be found presenting the marks required by the inspired record? The number of the Beast is six hundred and sixty-six; the Roman Catholic Church has all the attributes of this apostate power; it is a politico-religious system, which corresponds literally in its characteristics to the attributes of the Beast; and its name, and the

number of its name, prove that the papal power is the very apostacy designated in the Word of God as "the Beast."

But here, I must notice an objection, with which the Papist will be ready to meet us. "Antichrist is uniformly designated as a particular person, a single individual; now there is a great series of *Popes*, and consequently the Pope cannot be Antichrist." This objection involves the papist in an awkward dilemma; for unless he abandons this ground, he will be compelled to give up the grand proof text of Peter's supremacy, and all that beautiful line of apostolic, or rather papal succession, which is the boast of the Romish church. "Thou art Peter, and upon *this* rock I will build my church." According to Popish interpreters *this* rock is to be understood as referring primarily to Peter, and secondarily to the *line of popes*, whom they call Peter's successors. Now, I would ask, why may not the "Man of Sin," "Antichrist," &c. designate a series of persons holding the same office, as well as the words, "This rock" may denote Peter, and all the popes down to Gregory XVI?

But we need not adopt the Romish method of interpreting the passage adduced to prove Peter's supremacy, in order to show that the "Man of Sin" may properly designate a series of persons. Similar modes of speaking were common in ancient languages and are common in our own. If we turn to 1 Sam. viii. 11, we read: "This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: *he* will take your sons, and appoint them for *himself*, for *his* chariots, and to be *his* horsemen: and some shall run before *his* chariots. And *he* will appoint

him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and *he* will set them to ear *his* ground, and to reap *his* harvest, and to make *his* instruments of war, and instruments of *his* chariots," &c. Now throughout this passage, the king is spoken of as *one*, though it is evident a whole line of kings is intended. When we speak of the king of England, or the Emperor of Austria being intrusted with such and such prerogatives and power, do we not refer to a *line of men*, and not merely to the individual, who for the time being may hold that office? The objection therefore, that the "Man of Sin" is only an individual, and that there is a long series of Popes, is just as futile as all other Popish objections against Scripture truth. But then the Papist who has been indoctrinated into the delusions of his church will tell us: "The very meaning of ANTICHRIST shows that the Pope cannot be intended, for *Antichrist* means an opponent of Christ, whereas the Pope styles himself Christ's *Vicar*."

Whether the name Antichrist be interpreted as the opponent of Christ, or the Vicar of Christ, we prove that the title belongs to the Pope. We have already shown that the Pope exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; that he assumes the name, and usurps the power of God; but waiving this argument for the present, we prove to the Papist on his own terms that the pope is literally *Antichrist*. The Greek preposition *ἀντι*, means not only *against*, denoting opposition, but it also signifies *in the place of*, implying vicegerency; thus in Greek, the words, *ἀντιβασιλευς* and *ἀντιστратηγος* designate the officer next in rank to the king or captain; the *viceroys* or *lieutenants*; i. e. the person holding the place

of another in his absence, as his substitute or *vicar*. Hence we have, as the literal signification of *Antichrist*, the "*Vicar of Christ*." The objector may take just which signification he prefers, and in either instance, or in both cases, we prove the Pope to be *Antichrist*. But another plea which the advocates of the papacy advance to ward off the strokes of the sword of truth, is that the Pope calls himself, "The servant of the servants of God." If so, it only makes his hypocrisy the more glaring! The Pope, "the servant of the servants of God!" Why then does he permit others to accost him as their Lord God? "*The servant of the servants of God!*" How comes it then, that he compels every layman, and every priest who has the name and the mark of the Beast, and who desires a personal interview, to bow down and kiss his slipper, in token of abject submission? The Pope, *the servant of the servants of God!* How admirably that title suited the Supreme Pontiff, when Henry IV. of Germany stood shivering at his gate for three dreary winter days, before he could obtain an audience! How beautifully this title coincides with the power which he claims of absolving subjects from their oath of allegiance to their lawful rulers! The Pope claims to be the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, and then plumes himself upon his astonishing humility, in calling himself "the servant of the servants of God," when the pride of Lucifer is manifest in every official act which he performs. Here you have another striking evidence that the Pope is Antichrist. He identifies himself as the Man of Sin by thus *speaking lies in hypocrisy*. But I must not forget that there is another passage of Scripture which remains for consideration.

"I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy—and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour and decked with gold, and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication."

Here the same Antichristian power is designated as a woman arrayed in purple and scarlet colour. If we were asked to designate the colour, by which the Church of Rome is known, should we not at once select that which the inspired writer has chosen. See the Pope; his pontifical robes are purple and scarlet. Look at his cardinals—with their scarlet hats and scarlet cloaks, and sitting literally upon scarlet beasts, for their very mules are covered with scarlet cloth. Look at the Popish Bishops in our city, and are they not arrayed in purple and scarlet, when they appear in their Episcopal finery? See them with their glittering crucifix of gold, suspended from the neck by a chain of the same material; look at the brilliants that sparkle on their finger rings; see their robes bedizzened with embroidery of gold; look at his Lordship when he comes forth, with *"the golden cup"* in his hands, which he offers as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, when he celebrates the mass abomination; professing to change the wine—aye, and every drop of wine in that cup into the entire body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ; now remember, that idolatry and apostacy are constantly represented in the word of God under the figure of adultery and fornication, and then tell us, where we are to look for the original, to which St. John alludes in the text, if the Church of Rome does not furnish it? *"I saw a woman*

sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy—and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour and decked with gold, and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.” Need we be at a loss to discern the names of blasphemy? Do we not know that the Pope is accosted as Our Lord God the Pope—that he is commonly spoken of as SANCTISSIMUS, the Most Holy? And when these titles are applied to any save the Eternal Jehovah, who sits on the circle of the heavens, were they even ascribed to the highest angel in glory, would they not be “names of blasphemy?” How much more blasphemous when given to the arch-idolater and apostate, who styles himself the *Vicar of the Son of God* on earth! There he is—*arrayed in purple and scarlet, covered with names of blasphemy, and decked with gold, and precious stones and pearls, having that golden cup full of abominations and filthiness of fornication!*

But the apostle tells us farther: “Upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” Here again we find a startling accomplishment of this prediction in the Papal apostacy. Prior to the Reformation, the word MYSTERY was literally engraved in large characters on the front of the Pope’s crown. Luther pointed out the coincidence, and since then another motto has been substituted. But even waiving this evidence, we need only point to the doctrines of the Romish church to convince our readers that it is a system of MYSTERY from first to last. The object of the Papal

apostacy has been to mystify the plainest doctrines of Scripture, and to keep the truth from influencing the hearts and consciences of men. Hence the priests have perverted and mystified the Word of God, throwing hindrances in the way of its circulation, and pouring contempt upon the true version of the Bible. They have changed the sacrament of the Lord's Supper into the very "mystery of iniquity" by their blasphemous doctrine of transubstantiation. They have enveloped their doctrines in such a labyrinth of distinctions, and have cloaked them in such ambiguity, and have denied, and sworn, and forsworn, according to the Jesuit maxim, so effectually, that they have made Popery emphatically, a "MYSTERY!" Her name is also BABYLON THE GREAT. Here Roman Catholic writers themselves save us the trouble of producing proof that Rome is intended by Babylon. Peter dates his epistle from Babylon, and the Jesuits are so eager to prove that Peter was at Rome, that they are obliged to admit BABYLON to be the symbolical name of that great city. Bellarmine himself admits it, but he seeks to elude the force of the argument against his church, by applying this prophecy to Pagan, instead of to *Papal* Rome; but it will not do. Rome Pagan had no such marks as are here described; whilst Rome Papal has them all.

Pagan Rome was execrable in the eyes of all who bore the Christian name, but this *Babylon* was to infect the church with the filthiness of her superstition; hence if Babylon means Rome, and Romanists say it does, it can mean no other than *Papal* Rome. But is *she* "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth?" Aye,

that is she. Give the words their literal or their symbolical meaning, and in either case, *she* is designated. There is no other system of religion calling itself *Christian* that has ever encouraged lewdness and licentiousness, but the Church of Rome! She is the MOTHER of harlots! Rome itself, BABYLON THE GREAT, in which *his Holiness* reigns supreme, is a den of debauchery, a cage of unclean birds! Brothels are licensed by his authority, and his revenues are swelled by the price of lewdness! Look at papal countries in which the monastic system has prevailed, and let their history, whenever detached portions of it have been exposed to view, in spite of the efforts made to draw the curtain of falsehood over these deeds of darkness—I say, let their history tell whether Papal Rome deserves the name of the Mother of harlots or not! But consider the language as figurative. In the Scriptures idolatry is frequently represented under the symbol of lewdness; and in this sense, Papal Rome is still the mother of harlots. Does she not teach her followers to worship the consecrated host, as God? She teaches them that that wafer has been changed into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ! That if a single consecrated host is divided into ten thousand particles, each atom of that wafer contains the entire Christ, with his glorified body and soul! Could a greater abomination be conceived, than the doctrine, which teaches rational men to pervert a sacred ordinance, by worshipping a crumb of bread, as the Redeemer of the world? The wood of the cross is also an object of supreme veneration; it is to receive the worship of *latria*, according to the orthodox teachings of the infallible

church! The Virgin Mary is represented in some Popish books, as being GREATER THAN GOD, and the Pope himself calls her, in his encyclical letter, "the only foundation of our hope." Images and pictures of God, or the Saints, or the Blessed Virgin, Agnus Dei's, which are bits of wax, having the Pope's picture on the *one* side, and a representation of a Lamb on the other, bones, chips, rags, stones, &c. &c., are objects of veneration appointed by this idolatrous mother of the abominations of the earth!

But says the apostle finally, "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus!" We have fastened upon her the qualities of "mystery, lewdness, and idolatry," and it remains that we show again that the mark of "blood" also pertains to this apostacy. Who does not know that the Church of Rome has always been the grand persecutor of the saints? All her lying protestations of innocence; and the crocodile tears which she sheds when her iniquity is exposed will never wash out the crimson stains of blood, with which her hands are dyed! She has tortured the saints and martyrs of Jesus as though God had commissioned her to water the earth with his children's tears, and drench it with their blood! Oh! the shrieks of the victims of Papal cruelty have risen from every land, which has wondered after the Beast, and drunk of the Babylonish wine of fornication! Millions of lives have been sacrificed by the wars which this mother of abominations has fomented! And millions more have fallen under the swords with which she herself has armed her blood-thirsty slaves! Tens and hundreds of thousands have

perished at the stake, because they would not bow the knee, or bend the neck to Antichrist! France is filled with the bones of the slaughtered Huguenots! Germany is the grave of a noble army of martyrs, whose cry amid the flames and on the scaffold was "none but Christ," "none but Christ!" Spain is strewed with the ashes of many an Auto da Fe, at which those who loved God's word, and gloried in God's truth, were roasted alive by the hideous crew of Monkish Inquisitors, and Popish priests!

England has quivered in every nerve, under the torturing grasp of Antichrist; and Ireland has been drenched with Protestant blood!

If the blood of 68 millions of the human race is not enough to make the Babylonish woman drunk, she surely must be proof against intoxication! This blood has dyed her with its scarlet hue, and fixed the gory mark upon her, which stamps her as the blood-stained HARLOT, drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus!

THE DOOM OF ANTICHRIST.

AND I HEARD A GREAT VOICE OF MUCH PEOPLE IN HEAVEN SAY-
ING, ALLELUIA; SALVATION, AND GLORY, AND HONOR, AND
POWER, UNTO THE LORD OUR GOD; FOR HE HATH JUDGED THE
GREAT WHORE, WHICH DID CORRUPT THE EARTH WITH HER
FORNICATION, AND HATH AVENGED THE BLOOD OF HIS SERVANTS
AT HER HAND. AND AGAIN THEY SAID, ALLELUIA. AND HER
SMOKE ROSE UP, FOR EVER AND EVER.—Rev. xix, 1, 2, 3. See
also, Rev. xiv, 8—12, and xvii, 7, 9, 12, 16, &c.

Our readers are prepared to view the solemn language
we have quoted above, as directed against the church of
Rome.

We have already shown that the Marks of Anti-
christ as delineated in the Sacred volume are found upon
the Apostate Papal Church, and we proceed to contem-
plate the DOOM which awaits, and which will speedily
be executed upon this Arch-deceiver of the human
family. The passages of Scripture to which we have
referred, contain a vivid description of that fearful deso-
lation, which God will bring upon her; and in attempt-
ing to develope before you the meaning of this symbol-
ical language, in which the truth is couched, other in-
cidental marks will present themselves, which will still
farther identify the Church of Rome as the Apostacy,
which Jehovah hates, and which he will certainly de-
stroy !

"I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns." The angel then proceeds to explain the meaning of this symbol. "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth." The chain of evidence verifying the charge of apostacy and designating the Church of Rome as the great enemy of Christianity, becomes stronger, with every link which is added to it, and to a candid and intelligent mind, presents demonstration clear as day, that Rome, and Rome only is the Apostacy in question. When the nature of the predictions before us is considered; when we reflect that it is not only two or three particular attributes, which are pointed out by the finger of God as characteristic of the infernal power, which should oppress the church; that it is not only here and there, a peculiarity, which may by plausible construction, be fastened upon the church of Rome, as the great original, but that a very large array of particulars is enumerated, every one of which finds its corresponding *mark* in the doctrines, discipline, or practice of the Papal Despotism; when we bear in mind, that if our opinion respecting the power which we accuse, be incorrect, it will be manifest by the failure to prove that the different marks, detailed in Scripture are *all* found in the scarlet, blood-stained and idolatrous church to which we point; we say, these things considered, the continuous and unbroken series of circumstantial proof furnishes to our hand a chain of truth, firm as adamant, which we defy the united power of infidelity, and Popery to break! Let it be remembered, that the failure in one single item annihilates our whole scheme,

and at once delivers the church of Rome, from the charge of constituting the original of which St. John gives us the pattern. If the church of Rome forbids to marry—but does NOT command to abstain from meats, she is not the apostacy to which God's finger points! If she commands to abstain from meats—but does NOT give heed to doctrines of daemon gods—does NOT permit the worship of the departed spirits of men, she is not the power which we seek! If she does teach, that it is right and lawful to invoke the saints, but does NOT speak lies in hypocrisy, we slander her as often as we call her Babylon the Great! And, if her authorized systems of theology present us with so many sad evidences of lying deceptions, and monstrous frauds, that her claim to veracity must provoke a laugh of derision; still if she do NOT sit as God, in the temple of God, we err greatly in designating her as the Mother of Abominations! And if her priests do, in so many words, claim to sit as God in the temple of God, as often as they hear the confessions of their poor deluded dupes, yet if there be no “lying wonders,” to identify the church of Rome, as the false usurper, we must look elsewhere for the Man of Sin! And if the idle fabrications, and old wives' fables, which are published with the sanction of Romish dignitaries in our own city—if the impudent tale of the Holy House of Loretto, and the inconceivable fooleries narrated about Loyola, and Francis Xavier, and Liguori, furnish abundant counterpart to the “lying wonders,” yet, if the followers of these delusions are easily persuaded to abandon them, nay more, if they are NOT notoriously infatuated by their own errors, we must with all foregoing evidence before

us, acknowledge that we are still at fault! And if the deceivableness of unrighteousness, and most obstinate belief of falsehood characterize those who are deluded by the priests of Rome, yet if her history is not written in the blood of the saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus, she cannot be the church of Antichrist! And even if the souls of millions slain for the Saviour's sake, cry to God against her from under the altar, yet if there be no names of blasphemy upon the scarlet coloured beast, we may not say the Pope is Antichrist. And if the titles of "Our Lord God the Pope," "the Most Holy," &c. be arrogated by the Supreme Pontiff; even if he thus opens his mouth in blasphemies against the Most High, yet if there be no mark in the *right hand* or in the *forehead* by which all his followers shall be known, we must acknowledge that he is not the Head of the Great Apostacy! And if every Popish priest receives a mark in his right hand at his ordination, and every Romish layman, whether great or small, rich or poor, bond or free, male or female, is marked in the forehead on every Ash Wednesday, yet if the number of the Beast be not six hundred and sixty six, the number of a man, we must continue our search, for this is a requisite for whose absence, no former evidence can atone! And if the letters of the Greek name Lateinos, meaning the Latin or Roman man, numerically counted, make six hundred and sixty six, yet if it cannot be shown that Babylon the Great is the mystic name of Rome, we lose all that we have already established. This brings us down to the point contemplated in the text, and in addition to the evidence offered in our last lecture to identify Rome as

the place intended by Babylon, we are told in order to aid us still farther, and make our demonstration still more strong: "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth." If Rome is not built on seven hills, we confess Rome cannot be the metropolis in question, but if it is, we add another link to our chain, and our argument against Antichrist goes forward still in triumph! My readers need not be informed that Rome is built on seven mountains. Every school boy knows that the great Italian city covers seven hills. The beast which carried the woman, or the politico-religious power, which sustained the system of idolatry and falsehood, characterized as the "Great Harlot," had seven heads. It had also *ten horns*, and the angel tells the apostle, and through the apostle, the Church, what these horns signify: "The ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast." As the interpretation of the symbol is thus furnished to our hand, the only question of interest, which remains respecting them is, what kings are meant? By a reference to the context, and to collateral passages in the book of Daniel, we find that this inquiry involves four conditions. Thus we read, Dan. vii. 7: "After this, I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had *ten horns*." The characteristics of this fourth beast, as given by Daniel, show that the secular Roman king-

dom is intended by the fourth beast. He then proceeds Dan. v. 8: "I considered the horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots."

This little horn indicates the Papal power, and is identical with the beast spoken of in Rev. xiii. This identity is evident from many circumstantial proofs. 1. The power of the little horn and of the beast was to endure for the same period of 1260 years, indicated in the one case, Dan. vii. 25, by the time, times, and dividing of times, or three and a half prophetic years, equivalent according to the explanation furnished by Ezekiel, to 1260 common years, every day in those three and a half years being appointed for a year; and in Rev. xiii. 5, by 42 prophetic months, which contain, according to the ancient mode of reckoning thirty days to a month, exactly 1260 prophetic days, equal to so many common years. 2. The same beast with ten horns is mentioned by Daniel and by John. 3. The mouth of blasphemy belonging to each beast; which is found in no other case in all Scripture. 4. The object of their enmity in both cases, the saints of the Most High. 5. The twofold character of the rule; in Daniel, a beast and a little horn overruling it; in Revelation, a beast, and another beast like a lamb, controlling the former. In short there are so many points of coincidence between the two visions that there can be no doubt of the identity of the powers which are depicted in the 12th of Daniel, and the 13th of Revelation.

The fourth beast described by Daniel, and the beast

mentioned by St. John, both allude to the secular Roman power. Now, that territory, which the Roman Empire joined to the country occupied by the three kingdoms which preceded it, is exactly that portion of Europe, within the Rhine and the Danube, which is west of Greece and Thrace, or west of Turkey in Europe. This region then, the first condition of the text requires should be subdivided into ten parts, which are the ten horns of the beast.

The second condition is, that these ten countries should be governed, each by a crowned king; they must be distinct, independent kingdoms. A comparison of the 12th and 13th chapters of Revelation, enables us to define this second condition with greater accuracy. In the 12th chapter, the crowns are not upon the horns, but upon the seven heads; whereas, in the 13th, blasphemy is written upon the seven heads, which mean the seven hills on which Rome is built; and the crowns instead of being on the heads, are planted on the horns. (See Rev. xii. 3, and xiii. 1.) It was not, therefore, till after the reign of Augustulus, the last of the Roman emperors, in 487, when the crown was taken from the heads, that these ten kingdoms were to be found in separate, independent organization; for the crowns are not found upon the seven heads, and upon the ten horns at one and the same time. Hence, the second condition which is to be involved in the ten countries, to which we point, as indicated in the word of prophecy is, that they must be crowned kingdoms, not in existence anterior to the time of Augustulus, the last of the Roman emperors.

The third condition is, that they shall succumb to the little horn, "whose look," Daniel declares, "was more stout than his fellows;" they are to listen to his blasphemies, and be partakers of his sins. The prophet tells us, it is on this account that they will be punished. "I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words, which the horn spake : I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame."

The fourth condition is, that these ten kingdoms are to be in existence until the very end; prior to which, the beast which has hitherto been the servant of the papacy, will become its greatest enemy, will hate the whore, and burn her flesh with fire; but in the first place, they are to lend their power to the beast. Of course then, they must be in existence now, for as yet this secular power has not risen up to destroy the papacy. These four conditions, the territorial limits already defined; their separate organization as kingdoms subsequent to the reign of Augustulus, the last Roman Emperor; their subservience to the Pope; and their present existence; these four conditions, must be involved in the ten kingdoms which we may specify as the antitypes of the ten horns. To these we add a fifth condition, viz: that three of these ten horns must have been plucked up by the little horn or papal power.

Without going into many details, which, although interesting, we are obliged to omit, we shall give the results of the investigations of Irving and others, who have defined these ten countries, and proved that they possess the requisite qualifications, fulfilling all the conditions

required by the terms of Scripture. The ten kingdoms, we believe, to be the following. The government of the Senate of Rome, who revolted from the Greek emperors, and chose a new Western emperor: that of the Greeks in Ravenna: that of the Lombards in Lombardy; these three of the ten horns were speedily swallowed up by the little horn, or papal power, and the Pope wears a triple crown, in token of his authority over these three temporal states, thus literally fulfilling the prediction of Daniel; "I considered the horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots;" this circumstance then sufficiently verifies their identity. The seven remaining kingdoms, which meet the conditions of the inquiry are, Britain, France, Austria, Spain, Naples and Sicily, Portugal, and the Kingdom of Sardinia, including Savoy and Piedmont. These are all found within the territorial limits to which we are restricted; they were all organized as separate, independent kingdoms subsequent to the reign of Augustulus, they have all been subservient to the Pope, "giving their power and strength to the beast," and they all retain their distinct organization as kingdoms to the present day. These seven kingdoms, in connection with the papal states, cover the whole territory of the Western Roman Empire. They served the Pope in his merciless crusades against the saints and martyrs of Jesus, giving their power and strength to him, in order to enable him to subdue the Albigenses and the Waldenses, and the Culdees, and with the subsequent exception of Great Britain aiding him in his efforts to suppress the Reformation.

They have consented to the death of millions, who have been beheaded, and butchered, tortured, and strangled; of millions who have perished on the scaffold and on the gallows, and who have burned at the stake for no other crime than their ardent love to the Lord Jesus Christ! For thus aiding apostate Rome in her persecution of the Saints, God will pour out upon them the vials of his indignation, and will make them, first the executors of his vengeance against the Harlot of Babylon, and then, the monuments of his wrath against themselves. The beast shall be judged, and his body given to the burning flame, that the world may know, that none can aid in wearing out the Saints of the Most High without awaking in their behalf, the Eternal God as the avenger of his children! Not a cup of cold water given to a disciple of Christ, for the Master's sake, shall lose its appropriate recompense; not a favor, however trivial in human estimation, conferred for Jesus' sake upon the least of his brethren, shall be forgotten; all that is done for them, is done for HIM, whom they love, and who loves his church and people, with the infinite yearnings of an everlasting love! He has heard the groaning of his imprisoned children! His eye has pitied them, when in the loneliness of dungeons, dark and deep and loathsome, they have wept in the bitterness of their distress! Those tears are all preserved in his bottle! In all the afflictions of his brethren, he has been afflicted; whether quivering on the rack, or fainting on the scaffold, or dying amid the scorching flames, Christ has sympathized with his suffering people! When there has been no friendly hand to soothe their pain, and no voice raised to whisper

consolation, the angel of his presence has comforted them! God has remembered the wrongs of his saints, and the names of their persecutors are continually before him! He has His eye on every nation that has given the strength of its right arm to Antichrist! He watches the dust of a million of Waldensian Saints in France! He knows the graves of the Lollards in Britain, though marked by no sculptured stone! He needs no human record, or register of the slaughtered followers of Huss and Jerome in Bohemia, to tell him how many have loved his gospel unto death! The six and thirty thousand, whom the ferocious Duke of Alva consigned to public execution in the Netherlands; the ninety thousand, who perished within thirty years after the origin of the LYING Jesuits; the one hundred and fifty thousand, who were cut off by the Inquisition in less than thirty years, together with the untold, unnumbered thousands and tens of thousands, of whose wrongs and sufferings and death, no earthly registry has been kept; these, with ten thousand times ten thousand more, whose hearts have been wrung, and crushed, and broken by the grief of their bereavements; mothers, who have seen their children die for Christ's sake at the stake; wives, who have followed their Christian husbands to the scaffold, and have turned away to pine in sorrow, and die in wretchedness and want; orphans and widows, who have sunk under the blow that severed them from their protectors; these and millions more, cut off in their iniquity, and hurried into perdition by the cruelty of the Beast; all cry aloud to heaven for vengeance! The souls of the witnesses slain, who rejoice in glory, long for the

overthrow of God's enemy and ask, "How long O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" And God's chosen ones who cry to him from every Christian land respond to the angel who bids the churches rejoice over Babylon in anticipation of her fall! The Beast, which designates the secular papal power with its ten horns wearing crowns, denoting, as already shown, the kingdoms which have lent their power to the Mother of Abominations, shall receive the judgment which is due to this wicked connivance at her cruelty. It is to be observed, in so far as the *general* political influence of the Pope is concerned, that his power over these ten kingdoms is made to consist not in the force of arms, but in the "great words" which he uttered. It was for giving heed to these great words, which the little horn spoke, that the Prophet beheld the Beast and his body given to the burning flame. And what are the GREAT WORDS to which these kingdoms have given heed, but the edicts of the Pope to which kings and emperors have bowed, the papal claims which they have allowed, the papal imposts which they have permitted, and the spiritual sentences against excommunicated persons and heretics which they have executed, thus surrendering themselves to the discretion of Antichrist? Nor is this all; they have given their power to the Beast, by permitting the Romish clergy who were properly their subjects, to be amenable to ecclesiastical jurisdiction only; by permitting the laity to refer many causes to the See of Rome for adjudication, and in short by conferring innumerable prerogatives upon the Pope, and deferring to his authority as supreme, they have

yielded their strength to the aggrandizement of the apostacy. And to such enormous lengths has the papal usurpation been carried, that subjects have, by the Pope, been absolved from their oath of allegiance to the government, and obliged to forswear and renounce obedience to their sovereigns, or incur the peril of excommunication. The influence of the pontiff over the states of Europe, has been abundantly manifested in the mustering of their forces to assist the Pope, in so many crusades, as absurd as they were destructive, in the establishment of the Inquisition by his persuasion, and in all the various measures, adopted at his instigation, to crush the reformation, and wear out the saints of the Most High. Whenever the pontifical authority has been threatened, these powers have been ready to sustain it, with the blood and treasure of their subjects. Now, it is for thus lending themselves to Antichrist, and drinking of the Babylonish wine of fornication, that they shall be judged by the Lord Jehovah. What those judgments shall be, and when they shall be executed are not now the subjects of inquiry; we allude to the prediction that these kingdoms shall be visited with national calamities for their alliance with Antichrist, mainly in order to show by arguing from the less to the greater, that the doom of Antichrist himself shall surely be executed. If Jehovah has solemnly revealed his purpose to punish the accessaries, think you that he will suffer the principal to escape? If he comes forth as the avenger of his people against those who connived at their persecution, will he spare that apostate power which has originated, planned and accomplished all these deeds of perfidy and blood? He will not. The judge of all the earth will do right.

The papal power is temporal, as well as spiritual, and accordingly, we find that the Lord has judgments in store both in this world and in the world to come, which he will execute upon this accursed apostacy.

Now it is a common remark, verified by the political experience of the world, that God deals with states and empires for national sins, in this world, because in eternity, national distinctions will be unknown, whilst his retributions extend in the case of individuals, to a future state. Hence, inasmuch as the Church of Rome is a political, as well as a spiritual power, there is a *temporal*, and there is an *eternal* doom recorded against her. We will consider them both; and first let us read those words recorded against the Mother of Harlots, which refer to her temporal doom. It is said, "The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire." Rev. xvi. 16.

The first part of her temporal doom, which we notice is *the loss of her great wealth, and the utter destruction of her political influence*. The ten kingdoms, over which Antichrist has driven his chariot in triumph, will rise against their foul oppressor, and will hate the apostacy as intensely as they had formerly loved it. Spain is beginning now, to abhor the Babylonish harlot; and the piteous lamentations of the Pope, which are echoed by his Bishops and priests, in the proclamations of plenary indulgence to all the faithful, who will invoke the saints and call upon the gods of Rome, that by their influence, Spain may be brought again to bow submissively to the papal yoke, are so many indications, that the first burning drops from the vials of wrath, are falling upon the flesh

of the great harlot. Her cries will be as fruitless as the howlings of the priests of Baal, when they waited and prayed, and cut themselves and leaped upon the altars and kissed the images of their great idol, in the vain expectation that their oblation would find acceptance with Jehovah! Spain will never return to her allegiance to Rome! She will continue "to make desolate and naked" the Pontiff's authority, until his claim to spiritual supremacy will be the derision and contempt of her sons! His bulls of indulgence, even now, are laughed to scorn; and the menaces and promises of the Pope are treated with deserved contempt. This is a remarkable sign of the times, and it appears to us like the harbinger of the fulfilment of this prophecy. The kings begin to HATE the Babylonish woman. Spain, which formerly was periodically illuminated, by the glare of the blazing funeral piles of the martyrs of Jesus, when they were led out to suffer at the Auto da Fe, and whose monarchs, in person assisted at the pious ceremony of burning the enemies of Rome, has turned upon her spiritual despot, and is now "eating her flesh," by confiscating the immense treasures of the Church hoarded up in her splendid cathedrals, and in her monasteries and convents! Ecclesiastical Celibacy, no longer honored as a mark of superior sanctity, is justly regarded as the badge of laziness and lust, and the priests of Antichrist, who once were the lords of Spain, are now the target at which the jeers of her populace are hurled. This is only the beginning of sorrows; for Antichrist is doomed to see his influence melt away before the fiery indignation of freemen whose fathers were his slaves! The judgments of

God upon the nations that will not serve him, are usually delayed until the measure of their iniquities is full. Abraham was not permitted to possess Canaan, because the iniquity of the Amorites was not full. It was not until "the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah was great, and their sin grievous," that the destroying angel girded himself for his strange work; and Jerusalem stood until the Jews had filled up "the measure of their fathers, sins." Thus the voice from heaven proclaims, that the judgments of God upon Babylon, shall be executed because "her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Rome is rapidly filling up her measure! Every part of the world is witness to her zeal, in scattering the seeds of her abominations, and even the remotest Protestant missions have not escaped her pestilential visitations! France still lends her power to the beast, and compels Christian converts at the cannon's mouth, to receive the Jesuits whom the Pope sends to sow tares among the wheat! Notwithstanding the bitter experience of her sons during the reign of terror, and the dreadful wars and bloodshed of the revolution, France cannot see that the God of heaven is visiting her; but by continuing, for a season, political manifestations of regard for the Romish faith, she is fulfilling the prophecy that "Men were scorched with great heat, but they blasphemed the name of God which had power over these plagues, and repented not to give him glory." And yet the influence of Popery is fast waning, even in France. It is asserted by those who have the best means of ascertaining the truth, that a very large proportion, if not the majority of those who

profess the Romish faith in that country, are infidels at heart. A striking illustration of the above assertion, that Popery no longer exerts its former power over the hearts of the French as a people, is furnished, in a fact, which was stated, not long since in the Paris papers. One of the Romish Churches in that city, had become embarrassed in its pecuniary affairs, and it was resolved that in order to raise funds, some of the precious images of the Saints, which had long enjoyed the veneration of the faithful, should be sold at auction to the highest bidder.

The appointed time arrived, and golden visions danced before the eyes of the holy priests; but alas! their anticipations were baseless fabrics! One saint was knocked off for a few sous, and another, and another went at most beggarly prices, so that the whole proceeds of the sale amounted only to a few paltry francs. And like Micah of old, the poor priest was left to sigh, "Ye have taken away my gods, and what have I more?" Throughout the Papal states, even in Rome itself, although the populace are bowed to the dust by the most degrading superstitions, yet they hate the despot, who rules them with an iron rod, and were it not for the Austrian bayonets, which prop up his throne, they would drive the pontiff out of Italy!

In short, the developements which every day is bringing to light in the European kingdoms, show plainly that the Church of Rome is fast losing her *political* power; the occasional advantages, which she seems to gain, are merely the hectic flush upon the cheek of consumption. She is doomed to waste away, and her death warrant is sealed!

There will be visible manifestations of God's wrath against Babylon. Some good men have indulged, and have ventured to express the hope, that popery will gradually lose its distinctive character; that the superstitions and monstrous absurdities of the Romish faith will eventually be renounced, and that there will be a kind of reformation of Popery. But this is as illusive as it is unscriptural. Popery, as such, is not to be reformed; it is to be *destroyed*! The sins of the Church of Rome have bound her in chains which she cannot break. She claims to be infallible, hence it is impossible that she should reject her falsehoods! Her creed compels her to sustain past frauds by new artifices, and by brazen impudence! She will not repent of her evil doctrines and deeds, and therefore she shall perish! Even now, her delusions are grinding and crushing between the upper millstone of divine truth, and the nether millstone of infidelity; nor can all the vain assumptions and the crafty devices of Antichrist arrest this result. **POPERY SHALL BE DESTROYED!** There is no system of error, which the Almighty views with greater abhorrence than this, and he has himself pronounced its doom! "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death and mourning and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord that judgeth her." Rev. vii. 8. This passage, together with others, which we shall quote, plainly intimates that the vengeance of God will literally be poured out upon ROME. In another part of his vision, the apostle tells us that, "A mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone and cast it into the sea, saying, thus with violence shall that great

city Babylon be thrown down, and SHALL BE FOUND NO MORE AT ALL;" this last expression occurs no less than four times, and evidently indicates the entire destruction of Babylon! And in another passage, the kings of the earth are represented as witnessing her desolation. "They shall see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off for fear of her torment, saying, Alas! Alas! that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come!"

Her temporal destruction will be not only entire, but SUDDEN also. When she exults in her prosperity, and says boastingly, "I sit as a queen and shall see no sorrow," then her plagues will be showered from heaven upon her, and with violence she shall be cast down to rise no more for ever!

But fearful as the temporal doom of Papal Rome will be, it bears no comparison with the eternal weight of indignation which is treasured up against her, in the storehouses of Almighty vengeance. The strongest language in the whole Bible, employed to portray the horrors of the second death, is that which Jehovah pronounces against this apostate church, as a system, and against its members as individuals. And it is worthy of remark, that the fearful sentence recorded against her, is written under the direction of the Holy Spirit, by the hand of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and whose writings breathe the very spirit of gentleness. When he foretells the sure destruction of the Great Harlot, he points to the world of wo, to the bottomless pit, and the lake that burns with fire and brimstone! He bids us look upon the utter desolation coming suddenly upon her! We see her

plagues descend from heaven ! We hear her mourning, as she bows down to the lowest hell, under the crushing burden of her transgressions ! And as she sinks beneath the avenging wrath of the Lamb, high above the voice of her wailing, the angel's shout is heard, proclaiming in the ear of heaven and earth, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, is fallen ! Then, as that mighty echo reverberates through the lofty vault of heaven, it calls forth an answer from the hosts in glory : " And I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia ; salvation and glory and honour, and power unto the Lord our God : for true and righteous are his judgments ; for he hath judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluia. *And her smoke rose up for ever and ever.*" For ever burning, yet never consumed ! This is the doom that is recorded against Babylon ! The view of her destruction will fill all heaven with joy ! Saints and angels, the elders and the creatures fall down and worship God upon his throne, and cry Amen, Alleluia ! " And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him both small and great. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia : for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth !"

But there is a doom recorded in this divine register, against every MEMBER of this apostate church. Jehovah says, " If ANY MAN worship the Beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is

poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation ; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb ; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever ; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the Beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name !” And again it is said of them, “they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.”

It is no uncommon thing for those who affect great charity, to find fault with us for exposing the errors of the Man of Sin, but we leave it for our readers to say, whether that *love*, which leads men to soften the language of the Eternal God, and to excuse and palliate the sins of this Apostacy, be not the very essence of cruelty and a mockery of all charity ! With kindness, yet in faithfulness, we would warn our brethren who in bland and polished terms, pay Antichrist the compliment to reckon him as one with Christ ; beware, lest you be found, lending your power and influence to the Beast ! Here is the word of God ! If we believe, that all heaven will rejoice in the overthrow of Apostate Rome ; if God’s own *word* thus denounces the mystic Babylon, and proclaims her terrific doom ; if Jehovah will receive fresh glory in her destruction ; if every holy being, in that countless multitude of saints and angels will cry Amen ! as her smoke rises up for ever and ever, are not we, who love the Master, and love his truth, bound by every Christian principle to resist, and earnestly contend against the abominations of Rome ? It is because we love our Roman Catholic brethren, that we point them

to the marks of Antichrist, and urge them to flee from the wrath to come !

To the great congregations, who have so faithfully given us their attention, and delighted us by their interest in the words of the divine prophecy, we trust the blessing may be imparted, which is promised in the apostolic preface to the Book of Revelation :

“Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein ; for the time is at hand.”

FINIS.